arXiv:1504.03153v1 [math.DS] 13 Apr 2015

Hyperbolicity versus weak periodic orbits inside homoclinic classes

Xiaodong Wang

Abstract

We prove that, for C^1-generic diffeomorphisms, if the periodic orbits contained in a homoclinic class $H(p)$ have all their Lyapunov exponents bounded away from 0, then $H(p)$ must be (uniformly) hyperbolic. This is in sprit of the works of the stability conjecture, but with a significant difference that the homoclinic class $H(p)$ is not known isolated in advance, hence the "weak" periodic orbits created by perturbations near the homoclinic class have to be guaranteed strictly inside the homoclinic class. In this sense the problem is of an "intrinsic" nature, and the classical proof of the stability conjecture does not pass through. In particular, we construct in the proof several perturbations which are not simple applications of the connecting lemmas.

1 Introduction

1.1 Backgrounds and main results

We study in this paper a problem that is in sprit of the works of the stability conjecture but with an "intrinsic" nature. Let M be a compact manifold without boundary, and $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ be the space of C^1-diffeomorphisms of M. Recall the stability conjecture formulated by Palis and Smale claims that if a diffeomorphism f is structurally stable then it is hyperbolic. Here a diffeomorphism f is called *hyperbolic* if the chain recurrent set $R(f)$ of f (see Definition 2.9) is hyperbolic. A stronger version of the conjecture is to claim that if f is Ω-stable then it is hyperbolic. These two remarkable conjectures are solved by Mañé [35] and Palis [36], respectively.

During the long way of study of the stability conjectures, the attention was more and more concentrated on periodic orbits of the (unperturbed) diffeomorphism f as well as its perturbations g. Liao [33] and Mañé [34] raised independently a conjecture (more precisely, a problem without a tentative answer), known as the star conjecture, stating that if f has no, robustly, non-hyperbolic periodic orbits then it is hyperbolic. Being an assumption, the star condition is clearly weaker than the Ω-stability. Hence the star conjecture is regarded another (strong) version of the stability conjecture. It is solved by Aoki and Hayashi [3, 30]. To compare more precisely with our Main Theorem below we state their results in a generic version. Recall that if p is a periodic point with period τ of a diffeomorphism f, and if $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots, \lambda_d$ are the eigenvalues of Df^τ (counted by multiplicity), then the d numbers $\chi_i = \frac{1}{\tau}\log|\lambda_i|$, $i = 1, \cdots, d$ are called the *Lyapunov exponents* of $orb(p)$.

Theorem 1.1. (Aoki and Hayashi) *For a C^1-generic $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, if f is not hyperbolic, then there is a periodic orbit of f that has a Lyapunov exponent arbitrarily close to 0.*

Now we state our main result. Recall that two hyperbolic periodic points are *homoclinically related* if $W^s(orb(p))$ has non-empty transverse intersection with $W^u(orb(q))$ and $W^u(orb(p))$ has non-empty transverse intersection with $W^s(orb(q))$. To be homoclinically related is an equivalent relation, and the *homoclinic class* $H(p)$ of a hyperbolic periodic point p is the closure of the union of periodic orbits that are homoclinically related to p. Two different homoclinic classes may intersect. Nevertheless by the result of [8], for C^1-generic diffeomorphisms, every homoclinic class is a maximal invariant compact set that is *chain transitive* (see Definition 2.8), hence they are pairwise disjoint. Homoclinic classes are generally infinite in number, even for generic diffeomorphisms.

Main Theorem. *For a C^1-generic $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, if a homoclinic class $H(p)$ of f is not hyperbolic, then there is a periodic orbit of f that is homoclinically related to orb(p) and has a Lyapunov exponent arbitrarily close to 0.*

Note that here the "weak" periodic orbit (the one with a Lyapunov exponent arbitrarily close to 0) is homoclinically related to $orb(p)$, that is, is "inside" the homoclinic class $H(p)$. This is the main point of this paper. In fact, under the assumptions of the Main Theorem, it is straightforward to prove (following the classical proof of the stability conjecture) that, there must be a weak periodic orbit arbitrarily near $H(p)$. In contrast, here the Main Theorem claims there must be a weak periodic orbit not only near, but actually inside $H(p)$. Of course, if the homoclinic class $H(p)$ is assumed to be isolated, then being "near" will be equivalent to being "inside". The point is that here $H(p)$ is not known to be isolated hence, at each step, the periodic orbits created by perturbations have to be guaranteed to lie strictly inside the homoclinic class. It is in this sense we say the problem is of an "intrinsic" nature, and the classical proof of the stability conjecture does not pass through.

There are other conjectures aimed to give a dichotomy of global dynamics. Recall that a *homoclinic tangency* of a hyperbolic periodic point p is a non-transverse intersection between $W^u(p)$ and $W^s(p)$. A diffeomorphism is with a *heterodimensional cycle* if there are two hyperbolic periodic points p and q with different stable dimensions such that $W^s(p) \cap W^u(q) \neq \emptyset$ and $W^s(q) \cap W^u(p) \neq \emptyset$. It is obvious that any diffeomorphism with either a tangency or a heterodimensional cycle is not hyperbolic. Palis conjectured that these two phenomenons are the only obstacles for hyperbolicity. More precisely, the union of hyperbolic diffeomorphisms and diffeomorphisms with tangencies or heterodimensional cycles are dense in the space of diffeomorphisms, see [37]. Based on the results afterwards, Bonatti and Díaz conjectured that the union of diffeomorphisms that are hyperbolic and those with heterodimensional cycles are dense in the space of diffeomorphisms, see [7, 11]. There are many works related to this subject, like [40, 18, 22, 21]. [40] solved this conjecture for dimension 2, and for higher dimension, [18, 22, 21] got progress that far from homoclinic bifurcations, the systems has some weak hyperbolicity (partially hyperbolic or essentially hyperbolic).

By the Franks' lemma [24, 28], we can perturb weak periodic orbits to get periodic orbits with different stable dimensions. But it is not clear whether these periodic orbits are still contained in the non-hyperbolic homoclinic class after perturbation. Thus we have the following conjecture, which is an intrinsic version of Palis conjecture for homoclinic classes.

Conjecture 1. ([7, 9]) *There is a residual subset $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, such that for all $f \in \mathcal{R}$, if a homoclinic class $H(p)$ is not hyperbolic, then there is a periodic point $q \in H(p)$, whose stable dimension is different from that of p.*

By [15], one can decompose the dynamics into pieces, and each piece is called a *chain* *recurrence class* (see Definition 2.10). By [8], for C^1-generic diffeomorphism, a chain recurrence class is either a homoclinic class or contains no periodic point. We call a chain recurrence class without periodic point an *aperiodic class.* Recall that a *dominated splitting* $E \oplus F$ on an invariant compact Λ set is an invariant splitting of $T_\Lambda M$ and the norm of Df along E is controlled by that along F, and Λ is *partially hyperbolic* if $T_\Lambda M$ splits into three bundles which is a dominated splitting such that the extremal bundles are hyperbolic and the center bundle is neutral (see Definition 2.6). By [18, 22], for C^1-generic diffeomorphisms far from homoclinic bifurcations (or just homoclinic tangencies), an aperiodic class is partially hyperbolic with center bundle of dimension 1. In [10], they proved that if $dim(M) \geq 3$, then there are an open set $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, and a residual subset $\mathcal{V}$ of $\mathcal{U}$, such that any $g \in \mathcal{V}$ has infinitely many aperiodic classes, and each of them has no non-trivial dominated splitting. We state here a conjecture by S. Crovisier for aperiodic classes, which implies the non-existence of aperiodic classes for C^1-generic diffeomorphisms far from homoclinic bifurcations.

Conjecture 2. ([20]) *Let Λ be an aperiodic class for a C^1-generic diffeomorphism f, and $E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u$ the dominated splitting such that E^s (resp. E^u) is the maximal uniformly contracted (resp. expanded) sub-bundle. Then E^c has dimension larger than or equal to 2 and does not admit a finer dominated splitting.*

1.2 Main theorem restated

We give here a more general result rather than the main theorem. For a hyperbolic periodic point p, denote by $ind(p)$ its stable dimension.

Theorem A. *For C^1-generic $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, assume that p is a hyperbolic periodic point of f. If the homoclinic class $H(p)$ has a dominated splitting $T_{H(p)}M = E \oplus F$, with $dimE \leq ind(p)$, such that the bundle E is not contracted, then there are periodic orbits in $H(p)$ with index $dim(E)$ that have the maximal Lyapunov exponents along E arbitrarily close to 0.*

Remark 1.2. *If in the assumption of the Theorem A, $dimE = ind(p)$, then the periodic orbits $\mathcal{O}_k = orb(q_k)$ have the same index as p. Thus by the genericity assumption, they are homoclinically related with $orb(p)$.*

We give an explanation how Theorem A implies the main theorem. We assume that the second item of the main theorem does not happen, that is to say, all Lyapunov exponents of periodic orbits that are homoclinically related to $orb(p)$ are uniformly away from 0. Then by the genericity assumption, $H(p)$ has a dominated splitting $T_{H(p)}M = E \oplus F$, with $dimE = ind(p)$, (see [26] and Proposition 4.8 of [9]). By the conclusion of Theorem A and the assumption of no existence of weak periodic orbits homoclinically related to $orb(p)$, we get that the bundle E is contracted. With the same argument for f^{-1}, we get that the bundle F is expanded for f. Hence $T_{H(p)}M = E \oplus F$ is a hyperbolic splitting and we get the conclusion of the main theorem.

In [35], Mañé introduced a very useful lemma (Theorem **II.1**) to get weak periodic orbits under certain hypothesis. The statement is very technical and the original proof of Mañé is difficult, thus we will not state it here. Based on a modification of the proof of Mañé, Bonatti, Gan and Yang have a result for homoclinic classes, see [13].

Here we point out that, different from Theorem **II.1** of [35] and the result of [13], there is a genericity assumption in the main theorem and Theorem A. That is to say, the conclusion of the main theorem is a perturbation result and may not be valid for all diffeomorphisms. Thus one asks the following question naturally, whether the genericity assumption is essential in the main theorem.

Question 1. *Is there a homoclinic class $H(p)$ for a diffeomorphism f satisfying that all the Lyapunov exponents of all periodic orbits homoclinically related to $orb(p)$ are uniformly away from 0 but $H(p)$ is not hyperbolic?*

In some cases, we can give a positive answer to this question. In [42], Rios proved that there is a diffeomorphism on the boundary of the set of hyperbolic diffeomorphisms on surface, with a homoclinic class containing a tangency inside. Hence it is not hyperbolic (it does not have a dominated splitting because of the existence of tangency). In [14], they proved that for this homoclinic class, all the Lyapunov exponents of all periodic orbits contained in the class are uniformly away form 0. In fact, they proved more that all the Lyapunov exponents of all ergodic measures are uniformly away from 0. Examples of non-hyperbolic homoclinic classes with a dominated splitting can be found in like [16, 23, 41], but the homoclinic classes in these examples contain weak periodic orbits. For C^2 diffeomorphisms on surfaces, by the conclusions of [41], one can not give a non-hyperbolic homoclinic class with domination and without weak periodic orbits, which is unknown in the C^1 dynamics. Hence we have the following question which is a stronger version of Question 1.

Question 2. *Is there a non-hyperbolic homoclinic class $H(p)$ with a non-trivial dominated splitting for a diffeomorphism f satisfying that all the Lyapunov exponents of all periodic orbits homoclinically related to $orb(p)$ are uniformly away from 0?*

1.3 Some applications of the main theorem

In this subsection, we give some applications whose proof will be given after.

1.3.1 Structural stability and hyperbolicity

Recall that a diffeomorphism $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ is *structurally stable*, if there is a C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f, such that, for any $g \in \mathcal{U}$, there is a homeomorphism $\phi : M \to M$, satisfying $\phi \circ f = g \circ \phi$. The orbital structure of a structurally stable diffeomorphism remains unchanged under perturbations. Mañé proved that the chain recurrent set of a structurally stable diffeomorphism is hyperbolic, see [35]. Here we give a local version about this result.

It is known that a hyperbolic periodic point has a continuation. More precisely, for a hyperbolic periodic point p of a diffeomorphism f with period τ, there is a neighborhood U of $orb(p)$ and a C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f, such that, for any $g \in \mathcal{U}$, the maximal invariant compact set of g in U is a unique periodic orbit with period τ and with the same index as p. We denote this *continuation* of p by p_g for such a diffeomorphism g, and denote the homoclinic class (and chain recurrence class resp.) of p_g by $H(p_g)$ (and $C(p_g)$ resp.). Thus we say that a homoclinic class $H(p)$ of a diffeomorphism f is *structurally stable*, if there is a C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f, such that, for any $g \in \mathcal{U}$, there is a homeomorphism $\phi : H(p) \to H(p_g)$, satisfying $\phi \circ f|_{H(p)} = g \circ \phi|_{H(p)}$, where p_g is the continuation of p. Similarly we can define the structurally stability for a chain recurrence class $C(p)$ of a hyperbolic point. One asks naturally the following question, which can be seen as a "local" version of the stability conjecture.

Question 3. *Assume p is a hyperbolic point for a diffeomorphism, if $H(p)$ (or $C(p)$) is structurally stable, then is it hyperbolic?*

There are many works related to this question, see for example [26, 43, 47, 50]. In [47] and [50], they prove that structural stability implies hyperbolicity for the chain recurrence class and the homoclinic class respectively of a hyperbolic periodic point, under the hypothesis that the diffeomorphism is far away from tangency, or that the stable or the unstable dimension of this periodic point is 1. With the conclusions of the main theorem, we can give a complete answer to Question 3.

Corollary 1.3. *Assume f is a diffeomorphism in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ and p is a hyperbolic periodic point of f. If the homoclinic class $H(p)$ is structurally stable, then $H(p)$ is hyperbolic. The conclusion is also valid for $C(p)$.*

1.3.2 Partial hyperbolicity

Next result is that for a homoclinic class with a dominated splitting of a C^1-generic diffeomorphism, if the dimensions of the two bundles in the splitting satisfy certain hypothesis, then the splitting is a partially hyperbolic splitting (at least one bundle is hyperbolic).

Corollary 1.4. *For C^1-generic $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, if a homoclinic class $H(p)$ has a dominated splitting $T_{H(p)}M = E \oplus F$, such that $dim(E)$ is smaller than the smallest index of periodic orbits contained in $H(p)$, then the bundle E is contracted. Symmetrically, if $dim(E)$ is larger than the largest index of periodic orbits contained in $H(p)$, then the bundle F is expanded.*

As another consequence of the main theorem, we can give a proof of Theorem 1.1 (2) in [22] with a different argument. More precisely, we can prove that for a C^1-generic diffeomorphism far from tangency, a homoclinic class has a partially hyperbolic splitting whose center bundle splits into 1-dimensional subbundles, and the Lyapunov exponents of the periodic orbits along each the center subbundle can be arbitrarily close to 0. Denote $\mathcal{HT}$ the set of diffeomorphisms of $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ that exhibit a tangency.

Corollary 1.5. ([22]) *For C^1-generic $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{HT}}$, a homoclinic class $H(p)$ has a partially hyperbolic splitting $T_{H(p)}M = E^s \oplus E^c_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus E^c_k \oplus E^u$ such that each of the center subbundles E^c_i is neither contracted nor expanded and $dim(E^c_i) = 1$, for all $i = 1, \cdots, k$. Moreover, the minimal index of periodic points contained in $H(p)$ is $dim(E^s)$ or $dim(E^s)+1$, and symmetrically, the maximal index of periodic points contained in $H(p)$ is $d - dim(E^u)$ or $d - dim(E^u) - 1$. For each $i = 1, \cdots, k$, there exist periodic orbits contained in $H(p)$ with arbitrarily long periods with a Lyapunov exponent along E^c_i arbitrarily close to 0.*

1.3.3 Lyapunov stable homoclinic classes

Recall that an invariant compact set $\Lambda \subset M$ is *Lyapunov stable for f*, if for any neighborhood U of Λ, there is another neighborhood V of Λ, such that $f^n(V) \subset U$ for all $n \geq 0$. We say that Λ is *bi-Lyapunov stable*, if Λ is both Lyapunov stable for f and for f^{-1}.

The following results are about C^1-generic Lyapunov stable homoclinic classes. First, for C^1-generic Lyapunov stable homoclinic classes, we can get a similar conclusion of Corollary 1.4 under a weaker hypothesis.

Corollary 1.6. *For C^1-generic $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, if a homoclinic class $H(p)$ is Lyapunov stable and has a dominated splitting $T_{H(p)}M = E \oplus F$ such that $dim(E)$ is larger than or equal to the largest index of periodic orbits contained in $H(p)$, then the bundle F is expanded.*

With the conclusion of Corollary 1.6, we can give a positive answer to Conjecture 1 for bi-Lyapunov stable homoclinic classes.

Corollary 1.7. *For C^1-generic $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, where M is connected, if a homoclinic class $H(p)$ is bi-Lyapunov stable, then we have:*
- *either $H(p)$ is hyperbolic, hence $H(p) = M$ and f is Anosov,*
- *or f can be C^1 approximated by diffeomorphisms that have a heterodimensional cycle.*

From [22] (or Corollary 1.5), we know that for C^1-generic diffeomorphisms far away from tangencies, a homoclinic class has a partially hyperbolic splitting with all central bundles dimension 1. We have the following result about the index of periodic orbits for Lyapunov stable homoclinic classes. It is a direct corollary of Corollary 1.6 and we omit the proof.

Corollary 1.8. *For C^1-generic $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{HT}}$, if a homoclinic class $H(p)$ is Lyapunov stable and assume $T_{H(p)}M = E^s \oplus E^c_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus E^c_k \oplus E^u$ is the partially hyperbolic splitting, then the largest index of periodic points contained in $H(p)$ equals $d - dim(E^s)$.*

1.4 Propositions for the proof of Theorem A

To prove Theorem A, we have to use the following three propositions. Proposition 1 tells that for any hyperbolic periodic orbit $orb(p)$ and any invariant compact set K of a diffeomorphism f linked by heteroclinic orbits, we can get a periodic orbit that spends a given proportion of time close to $orb(p)$ and K by arbitrarily C^1 small perturbation.

Proposition 1. *Assume p is a hyperbolic periodic point of a diffeomorphism $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ with period τ and K is an invariant compact set of f. Assume there are two points $x, y \in M$ satisfying that:*
- *all periodic orbits in K are hyperbolic and $p \notin K$,*
- *$x \in W^u(p)$ with $\omega(x) \cap K \neq \emptyset$, and $y \in W^s(p)$ with $\alpha(y) = K$.*

Then for any neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, any neighborhood U_p of $orb(p)$, and any neighborhoods U_K of K, there are two integer l and n_0, such that, for any integers T_K,

1. *there is $h \in \mathcal{U}$ such that:*
   - *h coincides with f on $orb(p) \cup orb^-(x) \cup orb^+(y)$ and outside U_K;*
   - *the point y is on the positive orbit of x under h, with $\sharp(orb(x, h) \cap U_K) \geq T_K$ and $\sharp((orb(x, h) \setminus (U_K \cup U_p)) \leq n_0$.*
2. *for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there is $h_m \in \mathcal{U}$ such that,*
   - *h_m coincides with h on $orb(p)$ and outside U_p,*
   - *h_m has a periodic orbit O, satisfying $O \setminus U_p = (orb(x, h)) \setminus U_p$, and $\sharp(O \cap U_p) \in \{l + m\tau, l + m\tau + 1, \cdots, l + (m + 1)\tau - 1\}$.*

Remark 1.9. *It is obvious that, in the settings of the proposition, if we change "$\omega(x) \cap K \neq \emptyset$ and $\alpha(y) = K$" to "$\alpha(y) \cap K \neq \emptyset$ and $\omega(x) = K$", the conclusion still holds.*

Proposition 2 and 3 are in some sense doing an asymptotic connecting process from a point to an invariant compact set. Proposition 2 tells that if a point on the unstable manifold of a periodic orbit satisfies that its positive limit set intersects an invariant compact set, then we can make its positive limit set contained in this invariant compact set by a small perturbation. Moreover, the perturbation will not change certain pieces of orbit. In fact, we can get the first property directly by the conclusions of [17], but the second property is not a direct consequence.

Proposition 2. *(*A modified case of Proposition 10 in [17]*) Assume f is a diffeomorphism in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. For any hyperbolic periodic point p of f, for any invariant compact set K, and for any point $x \in M$, such that:*
– *all periodic orbits in K are hyperbolic and $p \notin K$,*
– *$\overline{W^u(p)} \cap K \neq \emptyset$, and $\alpha(x) \subset K$,*
then, for any neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, there are a diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$, a point $y \in W^u(p, f)$, and an open set V containing $orb^-(x)$, such that g coincides with f on the set $orb(p) \cup K \cup V \cup orb^-(y)$ and $\omega(y, g) \subset K$.

In the assumptions of the above two propositions, the point and invariant compact sets are linked by true orbits. However, Proposition 3 deals with the case that they are linked by pseudo-orbits which is more complicated. We use the technics of [8, 17].

Proposition 3. *Assume f_0 is a diffeomorphism in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. For any neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f_0 in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, there are a smaller neighborhood $\mathcal{U}'$ of f_0 with $\overline{\mathcal{U}'} \subset \mathcal{U}$ and an integer T, with the following properties.*
For any diffeomorphism $f \in \mathcal{U}'$, considering an invariant compact set K, a positively invariant compact set X and a point $z \in X$, if the following conditions are satisfied:
– *all periodic orbits contained in K are hyperbolic,*
– *all periodic orbits contained in X with period less than T are hyperbolic,*
– *for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a ε-pseudo-orbit contained in X connecting z to K,*
then for any neighborhood U of $X \backslash K$, there is a diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$, such that: $g = f|_{M \backslash U}$ and $\omega(z, g) \subset K$. Moreover, the C^0 distance between g and f can be arbitrarily small.

Remark 1.10. (1) *Proposition 2 is not a direct corollary of Proposition 3, because we wish to keep the negative orbit of a point that accumulates to the invariant compact set unchanged after perturbation in Proposition 2.*

(2) *In Proposition 3, we can see that $X \cap K \neq \emptyset$. Thus $X \setminus K$ is not a compact set and we have that $\overline{U} \cap K \neq \emptyset$, where U is the neighborhood of $X \setminus K$.*

1.5 Organization of the paper.

In Section 2, we give some basic definitions and well known results that we will use in the proof. In Section 3, we give a slightly different version (Theorem B) of Theorem A, and we prove Theorem A using Theorem B. After, we give the proof of Theorem B from Propositions 1, 2 and 3 in Section 4. The proofs of Proposition 1, 2 and 3 will be given in Section 5, 6 and 7 respectively. At last, we give the proofs of the applications of the main theorem in Section 8.

2 Preliminary

In this section, we give some definitions and some well known results. Denote by $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ the space of C^1-diffeomorphisms of M.

2.1 Hyperbolicity and dominated splitting

Definition 2.1. Assume that f is a diffeomorphism in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, Λ is an invariant compact set of f and E is a Df-invariant subbundle of $T_\Lambda M$. We say that the bundle E is (C, λ)-*contracted* if there are constants $C > 0$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, such that

$$\|Df^n|_{E(x)}\| < C\lambda^n,$$

for all $x \in \Lambda$ and all $n \geq 1$. And we say that E is (C, λ)-*expanded* if it is (C, λ)-*contracted* with respect to f^{-1}. If the tangent bundle of Λ has an invariant splitting $T_\Lambda M = E^s \oplus E^u$, such that, E^s is (C, λ)-contracted and E^u is (C, λ)-expanded for some constants $C > 0$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, then we call Λ a *hyperbolic set* and $dim(E^s)$ the *index* of the hyperbolic splitting. Moreover, if a periodic orbit $orb(p)$ is a hyperbolic set, then we call p a hyperbolic periodic point, and the dimension of the contracted bundle E^s in the hyperbolic splitting is called the *index* of p, denoted by $ind(p)$.

Definition 2.2. For any point $x \in M$, any number $\delta > 0$, we define the *local stable set* and *local unstable set* of x of size δ respectively as follows:
$W^s_\delta(x) = \{y : \forall n \geq 0, d(f^n(x), f^n(y)) \leq \delta;$ and $\lim_{n\to+\infty} d(f^n(x), f^n(y)) = 0\}$;
$W^u_\delta(x) = \{y : \forall n \geq 0, d(f^{-n}(x), f^{-n}(y)) \leq \delta;$ and $\lim_{n\to+\infty} d(f^{-n}(x), f^{-n}(y)) = 0\}$.
We define the *stable set* and *unstable set* of x respectively as follows:
$W^s(x) = \{y : \lim_{n\to+\infty} d(f^n(x), f^n(y)) = 0\}$;
$W^u(x) = \{y : \lim_{n\to+\infty} d(f^{-n}(x), f^{-n}(y)) = 0\}$.

Remark 2.3. (1) *It is obvious that, for any $\delta > 0$, we have*

$$W^s(x) = \cup_{n\geq 0} f^{-n}(W^s_\delta(f^n(x)))$$

and

$$W^u(x) = \cup_{n\geq 0} f^{n}(W^u_\delta(f^{-n}(x))).$$

(2) *To belong to a same stable set is an equivalent relation, thus two stable sets either coincide or are disjoint with each other. Similarly with the unstable set.*

For hyperbolic sets, the (local) stable (resp. unstable) set has the following properties, see for example [31].

Lemma 2.4. *If Λ is a hyperbolic set and $T_\Lambda M = E^s \oplus E^u$ is the hyperbolic splitting, then there is a number $\delta > 0$, such that, for any $x \in \Lambda$, the local stable (resp. unstable) set $W^s_\delta(x)$ (resp. $W^u_\delta(x)$) is an embedding disk with dimension $dim(E^s)$ (resp. $dim(E^u)$) and is tangent to E^s (resp. E^u) at x. Moreover, the stable (resp. unstable) set $W^s(x)$ (resp. $W^u(x)$) of x is an immersed submanifold of M.*

Definition 2.5. Assume that f is a diffeomorphism in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ and $p, q \in M$ are two hyperbolic periodic point of f, we say p and q are *homoclinically related* and denote the relation by $p \sim q$, if $W^u(orb(p))$ has non-empty transverse intersections with $W^s(orb(q))$, and $W^s(orb(p))$ has non-empty transverse intersections with $W^u(orb(q))$, denoted by $W^u(orb(p)) \pitchfork W^s(orb(q)) \neq \emptyset$ and $W^s(orb(p)) \pitchfork W^u(orb(q)) \neq \emptyset$. We call the closure of the set of periodic orbits homoclinically related to $orb(p)$ the *homoclinic class* of p and denote it by $H(p, f)$ or $H(p)$ for simplicity.

Definition 2.6. Assume $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. An invariant compact set Λ of M is said to have an (m, λ)-*dominated splitting*, if the tangent bundle has an Df-invariant splitting $T_\Lambda M = E \oplus F$ and there are an integer m and a constant $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\|Df^m|_{E(x)}\| \cdot \|Df^{-m}|_{F(f^m x)}\| < \lambda.$$

We call *dim*(E) the *index* of the dominated splitting. Moreover, we say Λ has a *partially hyperbolic splitting*, if the tangent bundle has an invariant splitting $T_\Lambda M = E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u$, such that the two splittings $(E^s \oplus E^c) \oplus E^u$ and $E^s \oplus (E^c \oplus E^u)$ are both dominated splittings and, moreover, the bundle E^s is contracted, the bundle E^u expanded and the central bundle E^c is neither contracted nor expanded.

Remark 2.7. *We point out here that if an invariant compact set Λ has two dominated splittings $T_\Lambda M = E_1 \oplus F_1 = E_2 \oplus F_2$ such that dim$(E_1) \geq$ dim(E_2), then we have $E_1 \subset E_2$. Hence two dominated splittings on an invariant compact set with the same index would coincide.*

By [27], there is always an *adopted metric* for a dominated splitting, that is to say, an (m, λ)-dominated splitting is a $(1, \lambda)$-dominated splitting by considering a metric equivalent to the original one. Also, it is obvious that an (m, λ)-dominated splitting is always an (mN, λ)-dominated splitting for any positive integer N.

2.2 Recurrence

We give some definitions of recurrence.

Definition 2.8. For a diffeomorphism $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ and a number $\varepsilon > 0$, we call a sequence of points $\{x_i\}_{i=a}^{b}$ of M an *ε-pseudo orbit of f*, if $d(f(x_i), x_{i+1}) < \varepsilon$ for any $i = a, a+1, \cdots, b-1$, where $-\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$. An invariant compact set K is called a *chain transitive set*, if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a periodic ε-pseudo-orbit contain in K and ε-dense in K.

Definition 2.9. Assume $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. We say a point y is *chain attainable* from x, if for any number $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an ε-pseudo orbit of f $(x_0, x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ such that $x_0 = x$ and $x_n = y$, and we denote it by $x \dashv y$. The *chain recurrent set* of a diffeomorphism $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, denoted by $R(f)$, is the union of the point x such that x is chain attainable from itself.

It is well known that the chain recurrent set $R(f)$ of f can be decomposed into a disjoint union of invariant compact "undecomposable" sets. More precisely, we give the definition as the following.

Definition 2.10. Assume $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. For any two points $x, y \in M$, denote $x \sim y$ if x is chain attainable from y and y is chain attainable from x. Obviously $\sim$ is an equivalent relation on $R(f)$, and an equivalent class of $\sim$ is called a *chain recurrence class*.

Definition 2.11. Assume $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ and Λ is an invariant compact set of f. We say that Λ is *shadowable*, if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$, such that for any δ-pseudo orbit $\{x_i\}_{i=a}^{b} \subset \Lambda$ of f, where $-\infty \leq a < b \leq \infty$, there is a point $y \in M$, such that $d(f^i(y), x_i) < \varepsilon$ for all $a \leq i \leq b$.

Now we give another definition of a relation, which is denoted by $\prec$.

Definition 2.12. Assume f is a diffeomorphism in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ and W is an open set of M. For any two points $x, y \in M$, we denote $x \prec y$ if for any neighborhood U of x and any neighborhood V of y, there are a point $z \in M$ and an integer $n \geq 1$, such that $z \in U$ and $f^n(z) \in V$. We denote $x \prec_W y$ if for any neighborhood U of x and any neighborhood V of y, there is a piece of orbit $(z, f(z), \cdots, f^n(z))$ contained in W such that $z \in U$ and $f^n(z) \in V$. Moreover, let K be a compact set of M, then we denote $x \prec K$ (resp. $x \prec_W K$) if there is a point $y \in K$, such that $x \prec y$ (resp. $x \prec_W y$).

For the relation $\prec$, we have the following result, whose proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 6 in [17].

Lemma 2.13. *Assume that K is an invariant compact set. Then for any two neighborhoods $U_2 \subset U_1$ of K and any point $y \in U_1$ satisfying $y \prec_{U_1} K$, there is a point $y' \in U_2$, such that $y \prec_{U_1} y' \prec_{U_2} K$ and the positive orbit of y' is contained in U_2.*

It is obvious that $x \prec y$ implies $x \dashv y$, but the two relations are not equivalent. In [8], they have proved that for generic diffeomorphisms, the two relations are equivalent.

Lemma 2.14. [8] *For generic diffeomorphism $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, if $x \dashv y$, then $x \prec y$.*

2.3 Pliss points and weak sets

Definition 2.15. Assume that Λ is an invariant compact set of a diffeomorphism f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ and E is an invariant sub-bundle of $T_\Lambda M$. For a constant $\lambda \in (0,1)$, we call $x \in \Lambda$ an (m,λ)-*E-Pliss point*, if for any integer $n > 0$, we have

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df^{im}|_{E(f^{im}(x))}\| \leq \lambda^n.$$

Particularly, if $m = 1$, we call x a λ-*E-Pliss point* for short.

Definition 2.16. Consider a diffeomorphism $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, an invariant compact set K of f, an invariant sub-bundle E of $T_K M$, an integer m and a constant $\lambda \in (0,1)$. We say that K is an (m,λ)-*E-weak set*, if for any point $x \in K$, there is an integer n_x, such that

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n_x-1} \|Df^m|_{E(f^{im}(x))}\| > \lambda^{n_x}.$$

We denote N_x the smallest integer that satisfies the above inequality. Particularly, if $m = 1$, we call K a λ-*E-weak set* for short.

Remark 2.17. *If K is an (m,λ)-E-weak set, by the compactness of K, we can see that N_x is bounded by an integer N_K for all $x \in K$. Also from the definition, we can see that an invariant compact set K is an (m,λ)-E-weak set if and only if K does not contain any (m,λ)-E-Pliss point.*

One can obtain Pliss points by the following lemma given by V. Pliss, see [38, 40].

Lemma 2.18. (Pliss lemma) *Assume that Λ is an invariant compact set of a diffeomorphism f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ and E is an invariant sub-bundle of $T_\Lambda M$. For any two numbers $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < 1$, we have:*

1. *There are a positive integer* $N = N(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, f)$ *and a number* $c = c(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, f)$ *such that for any* $x \in \Lambda$ *and any number* $n \geq N$, *if*
$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i x)}\| \leq {\lambda_1}^n,$$
then there are $0 \leq n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_l \leq n$ *such that* $l \geq cn$, *and, for any* $j = 1, \cdots, l$ *and any* $k = n_j + 1, \cdots, n$,
$$\prod_{i=n_j}^{k-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i x)}\| \leq {\lambda_2}^{k-n_j}.$$
2. *For any point* $x \in \Lambda$, *and any integer* m, *if for all* $n \geq m$,
$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i x)}\| \leq {\lambda_1}^n,$$
then there is an infinite sequence $0 \leq n_1 < n_2 < \cdots$, *such that*
$$\prod_{i=n_j}^{k-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i x)}\| \leq {\lambda_2}^{k-n_j},$$
for all $k > n_j$ *and all* $j = 1, 2, \cdots$.

Corollary 2.19. *For a diffeomorphism* $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ *and an* f*-invariant continuous bundle* $E \subset T_\Lambda M$ *of an invariant compact set* Λ, *we have that, for any* $x \in \Lambda$*:*

1. *If* x *is an* (m, λ)*-*E*-Pliss point, then there is a point* $y \in \omega(x)$, *such that* y *is also a* (m, λ)*-*E*-Pliss point.*
2. *If for any* $y \in \omega(x)$, *there is an integer* $n_y \in \mathbb{N}$, *such that*
$$\prod_{i=0}^{n_y-1} \|Df^m|_{E(f^{im}(y))}\| \leq \lambda^{n_y},$$
then for any $\lambda' \in (\lambda, 1)$, *there are infinitely many* (m, λ')*-*E*-Pliss points on* $orb^+(x)$.

Proof. By considering the diffeomorphism f^m instead of f, we can assume that $m = 1$. The proof of the general case is similar.

(1) By item 2 of Pliss lemma, for any $\lambda' \in (\lambda, 1)$, there are infinitely many λ'-E-Pliss points on $orb^+(x)$. Take a limit point of these λ'-E-Pliss points, denote it by $y_{\lambda'}$, then $y_{\lambda'} \in \omega(x)$ is a λ'-E-Pliss point. We take a sequence of numbers $(\lambda_n)_{n\geq 1}$ such that $\lambda_n \in (\lambda, 1)$ and $\lambda_n \to \lambda$ when n goes to infinity. Then for any $n \geq 1$, there is a λ_n-E-Pliss point $y_{\lambda_n} \in \omega(x)$. Taking a subsequence if necessary, we assume $(y_{\lambda_n})_{n\geq 1}$ converges to a point $y \in \omega(x)$. Then y is a λ_n-E-Pliss point for any $n \geq 1$. Since $\lambda_n \to \lambda$, the point y is a λ-E-Pliss point.

(2) By the compactness of $\omega(x)$, there is an integer N, such that $n_y \leq N$ for any $y \in \omega(x)$. There is a constant $C > 0$, such that, for any $y \in \omega(x)$, we have
$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i(y))}\| < C\lambda^n.$$

Take a constant $\lambda' \in (\lambda, 1)$. Take three constants $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_3$ contained in (λ, λ'). There is $N \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $C\lambda^n < \lambda_1^n$ for any $n \geq N$. There is $\varepsilon > 0$, such that, for any two points $x_1, x_2 \in \Lambda$, if $d(f(x_1), f(x_2)) < \varepsilon$, then $\frac{\|Df|_{E(f^i(x_1))}\|}{\|Df|_{E(f^i(x_2))}\|} < \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}$, for all $i = 0, 1, \cdots, N$. By considering an iterate of x instead of x, we can assume that $d_H(\overline{orb^+(x)}, \omega(x)) < \varepsilon$, where $d_H(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Hausdorff distance. Then for any $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\prod_{i=0}^{nN} \|Df|_{E(f^i(x))}\| < (C\lambda^N)^n \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\right)^{nN} < \lambda_2^{nN}.$$

There is $T > 0$, such that, for any $k \geq T$, we have $\lambda_2^{kN}\|Df\|^j < \lambda_3^{kN+j}$ for all $j = 0, 1, \cdots, N-1$. Then for any $n > TN$, assume $n = kN + j$, where $0 \leq j < N$, we have

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n} \|Df|_{E(f^i(x))}\| \leq \left(\prod_{i=0}^{kN} \|Df|_{E(f^i(x))}\|\right) \|Df\|^j < \lambda_2^{kN}\|Df\|^j < \lambda_3^n.$$

Then by item 2 of Pliss lemma, there are infinitely many (m, λ')-E-Pliss points on $orb^+(x)$. □

Definition 2.20. Assume that Λ is an invariant compact set of a diffeomorphism f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ and E is an invariant sub-bundle of $T_\Lambda M$. We call two (m, λ)-E-Pliss points $(f^n(x), f^l(x))$ on a single orbit *consecutive* (m, λ)-E-Pliss points, if $n < l$ and for all $n < k < l$, $f^k(x)$ is not a (m, λ)-E-Pliss point. And if there is a dominated splitting $T_\Lambda M = E \oplus F$ on Λ, we call $x \in \Lambda$ an (m, λ)-*bi-Pliss point*, if it is an (m, λ)-E-Pliss point for f and an (m, λ)-F-Pliss point for f^{-1}.

For Pliss-points, we have the following lemma. The technics of the proof can be found in many papers, for example [40].

Lemma 2.21. *Assume Λ is an invariant compact set of a diffeomorphism $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ with an (m, λ^2)-dominated splitting $T_\Lambda M = E \oplus F$. We have that, for any $\lambda' \in (\lambda, 1)$:*

1. *If a sequence of consecutive (m, λ')-E-Pliss points $(f^{n_i}(x_i), f^{l_i}(x_i))_{i\geq 0}$ satisfies that $l_i - n_i \to +\infty$, then, take any limit point y of the sequence $(f^{l_i}(x_i))$, we have that y is a (m, λ')-bi-Pliss point.*
2. *If there are both (m, λ')-E-Pliss points for f on $orb^+(x)$ and (m, λ')-F-Pliss points for f^{-1} on $orb^-(x)$, then there is at least one (m, λ')-bi-Pliss point on $orb(x)$.*
3. *If $x \in \Lambda$ is an (m, λ')-E-Pliss point and there are no other (m, λ')-E-Pliss points on $orb^-(x)$, then x is also an (m, λ)-F-Pliss point for f^{-1}. Thus x is an (m, λ')-bi-Pliss point.*

We have the following selecting lemma of Liao to get weak periodic orbits (see [32], [46]).

Lemma 2.22. (Liao's selecting lemma). *Assume $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. Consider an invariant compact set Λ with a non-trivial (m, λ)-dominated splitting $T_\Lambda M = E \oplus F$, and $\lambda_0 \in (\lambda, 1)$, if the following two conditions are satisfied:*

- *There is a point $b \in \Lambda$, such that, for all $n \geq 1$, we have:*

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df^m|_{E(f^{im}(b))}\| \geq 1.$$

– *For any invariant compact subset $K \subsetneqq \Lambda$, there is an (m, λ_0)-E-Pliss point $x \in K$.*
Then for any neighborhood U of Λ, for any $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ contained in $(\lambda_0, 1)$, there is a periodic orbit $orb(q) \subset U$ with period $\tau(q)$ a multiple of m, such that, for all $n = 1, \cdots, \tau(q)/m$, the following two inequalities are satisfied:

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df^m|_{E(f^{im}(q))}\| \leq {\lambda_2}^n,$$

and

$$\prod_{i=n-1}^{\tau(q)/m-1} \|Df^m|_{E(f^{im}(q))}\| \geq {\lambda_1}^{\tau(q)/m-n+1}.$$

Particularly, one can find a sequence of periodic points that are homoclinic related with each other and converges to a point in Λ. Similar assertions for F hold with respect to f^{-1}.

2.4 Perturbation technics

We give some tools for C^1-perturbation. First is the famous Hayashi's connecting lemma, see [29, 48]. The general connecting lemma deals with a single diffeomorphism and a given neighborhood. Here we give a uniform version that is valid to a neighborhood of a diffeomorphism, see [45].

Theorem 2.23. (A uniform connecting lemma, Theorem A of [45]) *Assume that f is a diffeomorphism in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. For any C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, there are three numbers $\rho > 1$, $\delta_0 > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, together with a C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_1 \subset \mathcal{U}$ of f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, that satisfy the following property:*
For any $f_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1$, any point $z \in M$ and any number $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, as long as the N balls $(f_1^i(B(z,\delta)))_{0\leq i\leq N-1}$ are pairwise disjoint and each is of size smaller than δ_0 (that is to say, $f_1^i(B(z,\delta)) \subset B(f_1^i(z),\delta_0)$), then for any two points x and y that are outside the set $\Delta = \bigcup_{0\leq i\leq N-1} f_1^i(B(z,\delta))$, if there are two positive integers n_x and n_y such that $f_1^{n_x}(x) \in B(z,\delta/\rho)$ and $f_1^{-n_y}(y) \in B(z,\delta/\rho)$, then there are a diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$ and a positive integer m such that $g^m(x) = y$ and $g = f_1$ off Δ. Moreover, the piece of orbit $\{x, g(x), \cdots, g^m(x) = y\}$ is contained in the set $\{x, f_1(x), \cdots, f_1^{n_x}(x)\} \cup \Delta \cup \{y, f_1^{-1}(y), \cdots, f_1^{-n_y}(y)\}$ and the number m is no more than $n_x + n_y$.

To control the perturbing neighborhood when connecting two points that are close, we have the following lemma, see [5].

Lemma 2.24. (Basic perturbation lemma). *For any neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of a diffeomorphism $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, there are two numbers $\theta > 1$ and $r_0 > 0$ satisfying: for any two points $x, y \in M$ contained in a ball $B(z,r)$, where $r \leq r_0$, there is a diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$, such that $g(x) = f(y)$, and g coincides with f outside the ball $B(z, \theta \cdot r)$.*

Definition 2.25. For a chart $\varphi : V \to \mathbb{R}^d$ of M, we call a set C a *cube* of φ if $\varphi(C)$ is the image of $[-a,a]^d$ by a translation of $\mathbb{R}^d$, where a is the radius of the cube. If a cube with radius $(1+\varepsilon)a$ and the same center of $\varphi(C)$ is still contained in $\varphi(V)$, we denote by $(1+\varepsilon)C$ its pre-image of φ.

Definition 2.26. Consider a chart $\varphi : V \to \mathbb{R}^d$. A *tiled domain* according to the chart of φ is an open set $U \subset V$ and a family $\mathcal{C}$ of cubes of φ (called *tiles* of domain), such that:

1. the interior of the tiles are pairwise disjoint;
2. the union of all tiles of $\mathcal{C}$ equals to U;
3. the geometry of the tiling is bounded, i.e.

- the number of tiles around each point is uniformly bounded (by 2^d), that is to say, there is a neighborhood for each point that meets at most 2^d tiles,
- for any two pairs (C, C') of intersecting tiles, the rate of their diameters is uniformly bounded (by 2).

By a standard construction, any open set $U \subset V$ can be tiled according to the coordinates of φ (e.g. [8, 19]).

Definition 2.27. Assume $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. Consider a neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ and a number N. A tiled domain $(U, \mathcal{C})$ is called a *perturbation domain* of order N of $(f, \mathcal{U})$, if the following properties are satisfied.

1. U is disjoint from its N first iterates of f.
2. For any finitely many sequence of pairs of points $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{1\le i\le l}$ in U, such that for any $i = 1, 2, \cdots, l$, the points x_i and y_i are contained in the same tile of $\mathcal{C}$, then there exist:
   - a diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$, that coincides with f outside $\bigcup_{0\le i\le N-1} f^i(U)$,
   - a strictly increasing sequence $1 = n_0 < n_1 < \cdots < n_k \le l$, such that $g^N(x_{n_i}) = f^N(y_{n_{i+1}-1})$ for any $i \ne k$, and $g^N(x_{n_k}) = f^N(y_l)$.

The union $\bigcup_{0\le i\le N-1} f^i(U)$ is called the *support* of the perturbation domain $(U, \mathcal{C})$ and denoted by *supp*(U).

Definition 2.28. A pseudo-orbit $(x_0, x_1, \cdots, x_l)$ is said to *keep the tiles* of a perturbation domain $(U, \mathcal{C})$ of order N of $(f, \mathcal{U})$, if the intersection of the pseudo-orbit and *supp*(U) is a union of segments $x_{n_i}, x_{n_i+1}, \cdots, x_{n_i+N-1}$ of the form that $x_{n_i} \in U$ and for any $j = 1, 2, \cdots, N-1$, $x_{n_i+j} = f^j(y_{n_i})$, where y_{n_i} is a point contained in the same tile of $\mathcal{C}$ as x_{n_i}. A pseudo-orbit $(x_0, x_1, \cdots, x_k)$ is said to *have jumps only in tiles* of a perturbation domain $(U, \mathcal{C})$ of order N of $(f, \mathcal{U})$, if it keeps the tiles and for any $x_i \notin$ *supp*(U), we have $x_{i+1} = f(x_i)$. For a family of perturbation domains $(U_k, \mathcal{C}_k)_{k\ge 0}$ of order N_k of $(f, \mathcal{U}_k)$ with disjoint support, we say that a pseudo-orbit $(x_0, x_1, \cdots, x_l)$ has *jumps only in tiles* of the perturbation domains $(U_k, \mathcal{C}_k)_{k\ge 0}$, if it keeps the tiles of the perturbation domains and for any $x_i \notin \bigcup_k$ *supp*(U_k), we have $x_{i+1} = f(x_i)$.

By the proof of connecting lemma in [6], the perturbation domain always exists (see also Théorème 2.1 of [8] and Théorème 3.3 of [19]).

Theorem 2.29. (Another statement of the connecting lemma) *For any neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f, there is an integer $N \ge 1$, and for all point $p \in M$, there is a chart $\varphi : V \to \mathbb{R}^d$ such that any tiled domain $(U, \mathcal{C})$ according to φ disjoint from its N first iterates is a perturbation domain of order N for $(f, \mathcal{U})$.*

From the definitions above, we can get the following lemma easily.

Lemma 2.30. (Lemme 2.3 of [8]) *For a family of disjoint perturbation domains $(U_k, \mathcal{C}_k)$ of order N_k of $(f, \mathcal{U}_k)$ with disjoint support, if there is a pseudo-orbit $(p = p_0, p_1, \cdots, p_m = q)$ that has only jumps in the tiles of $(U_k, \mathcal{C}_k)_{k\ge 0}$ and $p_0, p_m \notin U_k \cup \cdots \cup f^{N_k-1}(U_k)$ for all*

$k \geq 0$, then for any i, there is $g_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$ and a new pseudo-orbit $(p = p'_0, \cdots, p'_{m'} = q)$ of g_i that has only jumps in the tiles of domains $(U_k, \mathcal{C}_k)_{k\geq 0, k\neq i}$. Moreover, $g_i = f|_{M\setminus(U_i\cup\cdots\cup f^{N_i-1}(U_i))}$ and $\{p'_0, \cdots, p'_{m'}\} \setminus (U_i \cup \cdots \cup f^{N_i-1}(U_i)) \subset \{p_0, p_1, \cdots, p_m\}$, and $m' \leq m$.

2.5 Topological towers

In this subsection, we introduce two lemmas of [8] that are useful to get a true orbit by perturbing a pseudo-orbit. These two lemmas are the key tools in the proof of Proposition 3. First we give the following lemma that is useful to choose perturbation neighborhoods. In fact, it is a general result of Lemma 3.7 in [8], but one can get the conclusion directly from the proof in [8].

Lemma 2.31. *There is a constant $\kappa_d > 0$ (which only depends on the dimension d of M) satisfying the following property: assume $N > 0$ is an integer and W' and V' are two compact sub-manifolds with boundary of M of dimension d, if V' is disjoint from its $\kappa_d N$ first iterates, then, for any neighborhood U_1 of W' and any neighborhood U_2 of V', there is an open set S, such that:*

1. *$V' \subset \bigcup_{i=0}^{\kappa_d N} f^{-i}(S)$.*
2. *$S = W \cup V$, where W and V satisfy the following:*
   - *$W' \subset W \subset U_1$;*
   - *V is contained in $U_2 \cup f(U_2) \cup \cdots \cup f^{\kappa_d N}(U_2)$ and disjoint from its N first iterates.*
   - *$\overline{W} \cap (\bigcup_{i=-N}^{N} f^i(\overline{V})) = \emptyset$.*

Then, we give a lemma of [8] for the construction of what they called *topological tower* (see Théorème 3.1 and Corollaire 3.1 in [8]). Denote by $Per_{N_0}(f)$ the set of periodic orbits contained with period less than N_0,

Lemma 2.32. (Topological Tower*) There is a constant $\kappa_d > 0$ (which only depends on the dimension d of M), such that, for any $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, any constant $\delta > 0$, any compact set K of $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ that does not contain any non-hyperbolic periodic orbits with periods less than $\kappa_d N_0$ and any neighborhood U_0 of K, there exist an open set V and a compact set $D \subset V$, satisfying the following properties:*

1. *For any point $x \in K$ with $x \notin \bigcup_{p\in Per_{N_0}(f)} W^s_\delta(p)$, there is $n > 0$, such that $f^n(x) \in int(D)$.*
2. *The sets $\overline{V}, f(\overline{V}), \cdots, f^{N_0}(\overline{V})$ are pairwise disjoint.*
3. *The set $\overline{V}$ is contained in $U_0 \cup f(U_0) \cup \cdots \cup f^{\kappa_d N_0}(U_0)$.*

Moreover, the diameter of all connected components of V can be arbitrarily small.

Remark 2.33. (1) *In [8], the lemma is stated for an invariant compact set K, and the third property is not stated. But from the proof of the existence of topological tower, we can see that it is also true for non-invariant compact sets and also the third property is true.*

(2) *We explain a sketch of the proof of Lemma 2.32. Take κ_d to be the constant in Lemma 2.31. First, one can take a compact sub-manifold U_0 of M with boundary that is disjoint from its first N_0 iterates, such that, any point in a small neighborhood O of $Per_{N_0}(f)$ that is not on the local stable manifold of $Per_{N_0}(f)$ has a positive iterate in U_0. Then one can take a finite cover of the compact set $K \setminus O$ by open sets that are disjoint from their first $\kappa_d N_0$ iterates (generally, they are not disjoint from each other). Finally, by Lemma 2.31,*

one can construct an open set that is disjoint from its first N_0 *iterates by a finite induction, such that, any point that is not on the local stable manifold of* $Per_{N_0}(f)$ *has a positive iterate in it.*

2.6 Generic properties

A set R of a topological Baire space X is called a *residual* set, if R contains a dense G_δ set of X. We say a property is a *generic* property of X, if there is a residual set $R \subset X$, such that each element contained in R satisfies the property. We give some well known C^1-generic properties of diffeomorphisms in the following lemma. These results can be found in many papers like [12, 17, 39].

Lemma 2.34. *There is a residual set* $\mathcal{R}$ *in* $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ *of diffeomorphisms, such that any* $f \in \mathcal{R}$ *satisfies the following properties:*

1. *The diffeomorphism* f *is Kupka-Smale: all periodic points of* f *are hyperbolic and the stable and unstable manifolds of periodic orbits intersect transversely.*
2. *The periodic points are dense in the chain recurrent set and any chain recurrence class is either a homoclinic class or contains no periodic point.*
3. *For a periodic point* p *of* f*, there exists a* C^1*-neighborhood* $\mathcal{U}_1$ *of* f*, such that every* $g \in \mathcal{U}_1 \cap \mathcal{R}$ *is a continuity point for the map* $g \mapsto H(p_g, g)$ *where* p_g *is the continuation of* p *for* g*, where the continuity is with respect to the Hausdorff distance between compact subsets of* M*.*
4. *If* $H(p)$ *is a homoclinic class of* f*, then there exists an interval* $[\alpha, \beta]$ *of natural numbers and a* C^1*-neighborhood* $\mathcal{U}_2$ *of* f*, such that for every* $g \in \mathcal{U}_2$*, the set of indices of hyperbolic periodic points contained in* $H(p_g, g)$ *is* $[\alpha, \beta]$*. Also, all periodic points of the same index contained in* $H(p)$ *are homoclinically related.*
5. *If a homoclinic class* $H(p)$ *contains periodic orbits with different indices, then* f *can be* C^1 *approximated by diffeomorphisms having a heterodimensional cycle.*
6. *If a homoclinic class* $H(p)$ *is Lyapunov stable, then there is a* C^1 *neighborhood* $\mathcal{U}_3$ *of* f*, such that for any* $g \in \mathcal{U}_3 \cap \mathcal{R}$*, the homoclinic class* $H(p_g, g)$ *is also Lyapunov stable.*

3 Norm of products and product of norms: reduction of the proof of Theorem A

Theorem A essentially follows from the theorem below.

Theorem B. *For* C^1*-generic* $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$*, assume that* p *is a hyperbolic periodic point of* f *and that the homoclinic class* $H(p)$ *has a dominated splitting* $T_{H(p)}M = E \oplus F$*, with* $dimE \leq ind(p)$*, such that the bundle* E *is not contracted. Then there are a constant* $\lambda_0 \in (0,1)$*, an integer* $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$*, satisfying: for any* $m \in \mathbb{N}$ *with* $m \geq m_0$*, any constants* $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (\lambda_0, 1)$ *with* $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$*, there is a sequence of different periodic orbits* $\mathcal{O}_k = orb(q_k)$ *with period* $\tau(q_k)$ *contained in* $H(P)$*, such that*

$$\lambda_1{}^{\tau(q_k)} < \prod_{0 \leq i < \tau(q_k)/m} \|Df^m|_{E(f^{im}(q_k))}\| < \lambda_2{}^{\tau(q_k)}.$$

From Theorem B, we can get periodic orbits that have certain controls of the product of norms along the bundle E. To control Lyapunov exponents of the periodic orbits, we have to control the norm of products along the bundle E. We have to use the following two lemmas. The first is a perturbation lemma for matrixes to control exponents, see [19, 38] (also see [32, 34]).

Lemma 3.1. *For any integer $d \geq 1$, $K \geq 1$, any constant $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$, there are two integers N and τ_0, such that for any $A_1, \cdots, A_\tau$ in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ with $\tau \geq \tau_0$, and $max_{1\leq i\leq\tau}\{\|A_i\|, \|A_i^{-1}\|\} \leq K$, if*

$$\prod_{0\leq i<\tau/N} \|A_{(i+1)N} \cdots A_{iN+2}A_{iN+1}\| \geq \lambda^\tau,$$

then, there are $B_1, \cdots, B_\tau$ in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$, with $\|B_i - A_i\| < \varepsilon$ and $\|B_i^{-1} - A_i^{-1}\| < \varepsilon$, for all $i = 1, \cdots, \tau$, such that the maximal norm of eigenvalue of $B_\tau \circ \cdots \circ B_2 \circ B_1$ is bigger than λ.

Remark 3.2. *In [19], it is presented for the constant $\lambda = 1$. If $\lambda \neq 1$, then by considering $A_i' = \lambda^{-1} Id \circ A_i$ and applying the special case for the constant 1, we can get the general statement as above.*

Corollary 3.3. *For any integer $d \geq 1$, $K \geq 1$, any constant $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, there are two integers N and τ_0, such that for any $A_1, \cdots, A_\tau$ in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ with $\tau \geq \tau_0$, and $max_{1\leq i\leq\tau}\{\|A_i\|, \|A_i^{-1}\|\} \leq K$, if*

$$\lambda_1^\tau < \prod_{0\leq i<\tau/N} \|A_{(i+1)N} \cdots A_{iN+2}A_{iN+1}\| < \lambda_2^\tau,$$

then, there are $B_1, \cdots, B_\tau$ in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$, with $\|B_i - A_i\| < \varepsilon$ and $\|B_i^{-1} - A_i^{-1}\| < \varepsilon$, for all $i = 1, \cdots, \tau$, such that the maximal norm of eigenvalue of $B_\tau \circ \cdots \circ B_2 \circ B_1$ is in the interval (λ_1, λ_2).

Proof. We take ε small enough such that, for any $A \in GL(d, \mathbb{R})$, if $\|A^{-1}\| \leq K$, then $B(A, \varepsilon) \in GL(d, \mathbb{R})$, where $B(A, \varepsilon)$ is the ε ball of A. By the assumption of A_i, we have that the maximal norm of eigenvalue of $A_\tau \circ \cdots \circ A_2 \circ A_1$ is smaller than λ_2. By Lemma 3.1, we can get $B_1^0, \cdots, B_\tau^0$ in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$ that satisfies the conclusion for the number λ_1. We take a path $A_{i,t}|_{0\leq t\leq 1}$ contained in $B(A_i, \varepsilon)$ that connects A_i to B_i^0. We have that the maximal norm of eigenvalue of $B_\tau^0 \circ \cdots \circ B_2^0 \circ B_1^0$ is bigger than λ_1. Then there must be a time $0 < t < 1$, such that the maximal norm of eigenvalue of $A_{\tau,t} \circ \cdots \circ A_{2,t} \circ A_{1,t}$ is in the interval (λ_1, λ_2). We take $B_i = A_{i,t}$ and get the conclusion. □

The next lemma is a generalized Frank's lemma by N. Gourmelon that preserves some pieces of invariant manifolds of hyperbolic period orbits, see [28].

Lemma 3.4. *Consider a constant $\varepsilon > 0$, a diffeomorphism $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ and a hyperbolic periodic orbit $\mathcal{O} = orb(q)$ of f with period τ. Assume there is a one-parameter family of linear maps $(A_{n,t})_{n=0,1,\cdots,\tau-1; t\in[0,1]}$ in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$, satisfying:*

- *(1) $A_{n,0} = Df(f^n(q))$,*
- *(2) for all $n = 0, 1, \cdots, \tau - 1$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, we have $\|Df(f^n(q)) - A_{n,t}\| < \varepsilon$ and $\|Df^{-1}(f^n(q)) - A_{n,t}^{-1}\| < \varepsilon$,*

– (3) $A_{\tau-1,t} \circ \cdots \circ A_{0,t}$ *is hyperbolic for all* $t \in [0,1]$.

Then, for any neighborhood V *of* $\mathcal{O}$*, any* $\delta > 0$*, and any pair of compact sets* $K^s \subset W^s_\delta(\mathcal{O}, f)$ *and* $K^u \subset W^u_\delta(\mathcal{O}, f)$ *disjoint from* V*, there is a diffeomorphism* $g \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ *that is* ε*-*C^1 *close to* f*, such that:*

(a) g *coincides with* f *on* $\mathcal{O}$ *and outside* V*;*

(b) $K^s \subset W^s_\delta(\mathcal{O}, g)$ *and* $K^u \subset W^u_\delta(\mathcal{O}, g)$*;*

(c) $Dg(g^n(q)) = Dg(f^n(q)) = A_{n,1}$ *for all* $n = 0, \cdots, \tau - 1$.

Now we give the proof of Theorem A from Theorem B.

Proof. By Theorem B, we get two constants $\lambda_0 \in (0,1)$ and $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. We prove that for any $\lambda_0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < 1$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a diffeomorphism g that is C^1-ε close to f and g has a periodic orbit $orb(q)$ homoclinic related to p_g such that the largest Lyapunov exponent along E of $orb(q)$ is in the interval $(\log \lambda_1, \log \lambda_2)$. Then by the genericity of f and Lemma 2.1 of [26], f itself has such periodic orbits. Since λ_1 can be taken arbitrarily close to 1, we get the conclusion of the Theorem A. Take $d = dim(M)$ and $K = max\{\|Df\|, \|Df^{-1}\|\}$. Now we fix the constants ε and $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ in $(\lambda_0, 1)$. By Corollary 3.3, we get two integers N and τ_0.

By Theorem B, there is a periodic orbit $orb(q)$ of f with period $\tau > \tau_0$ that is homoclinically related to $orb(p)$, such that,

$$\lambda_1{}^\tau < \prod_{0 \le i < \tau/m} \|Df^m|_{E(f^{im}(q))}\| < \lambda_2{}^\tau,$$

where $m > m_0$ is a multiple of N. Denote $A_i = Df|_{f^i(q)}$ for $i = 0, \cdots, \tau - 1$. Since $E \oplus F$ is a dominated splitting, the two bundles E and F are transverse with each other, thus there is a lower bound of the angle between E and F. By Corollary 3.3, there are $B_0, \cdots, B_{\tau-1}$ in $GL(d, \mathbb{R})$, with $\|B_i - A_i\| < \varepsilon$ and $\|B_i^{-1} - A_i^{-1}\| < \varepsilon$, for all $i = 0, \cdots, \tau - 1$, such that, B_i coincides with A_i along the bundle F and the maximal norm of eigenvalue of $B_{\tau-1} \circ \cdots \circ B_1 \circ B_0$ along the bundle E is in the interval (λ_1, λ_2). We take a path $A_{i,t}|_{0 \le t \le 1}$ contained in $B(A_i, \varepsilon)$ that connects A_i to B_i such that $A_{i,t}$ coincides with A_i along the bundle F for all $i = 0, \cdots, \tau - 1$ and all $t \in (0,1)$. If there is a time $t \in (0,1)$ such that $A_{\tau-1,t} \circ \cdots A_{0,t}$ is not hyperbolic, then there must be a time $t_0 < t$, such that $A_{\tau-1,s} \circ \cdots A_{0,s}$ is hyperbolic for all $0 \le s \le t_0$, and the maximal norm of eigenvalue of $A_{\tau-1,t_0} \circ \cdots A_{0,t_0}$ along the bundle E is in the interval (λ_1, λ_2). Otherwise, we can take $t_0 = 1$

Take a small constant $\delta > 0$, since $orb(q)$ is homoclinically related to $orb(p)$, there exist two points $x \in W^s_\delta(orb(q)) \pitchfork W^u(orb(p))$ and $y \in W^u_\delta(orb(q)) \pitchfork W^s(orb(p))$. We take a pair of compact sets $K^s \subset W^s_\delta(orb(q))$ and $K^u \subset W^u_\delta(orb(q))$ such that $x \in K^s$ and $y \in K^u$. Then we take a neighborhood V of $orb(q)$ such that $V \cap (K^s \cup K^u) = \emptyset$ and $V \cap (orb^-(x) \cup orb^+(y)) = \emptyset$. By Lemma 3.4, considering the one-parameter family of linear maps $(A_{i,t})_{i=0,\cdots,\tau-1; t \in [0,t_0]}$, there is a diffeomorphism g that is C^1-ε close to f, such that:

(a) g coincides with f on $orb(q)$ and outside V;

(b) $K^s \subset W^s_\delta(orb(q), g)$ and $K^u \subset W^u_\delta(orb(q), g)$;

(c) $Dg(g^i(q)) = Dg(f^i(q)) = A_{i,t_0}$ for all $i = 0, \cdots, \tau - 1$.

Then $x \in W^s_\delta(orb(q), g) \cap W^u(orb(p), g)$ and $y \in W^u_\delta(orb(q), g) \cap W^s(orb(p), g)$, and by another small perturbation if necessary, we can assume that the two intersections are transverse. Then the two periodic orbits $orb(q)$ and $orb(p)$ of g are still homoclinically related with each other, and the largest Lyapunov exponent of $orb(q)$ along the bundle E under the diffeomorphism g is in the interval $(\log \lambda_1, \log \lambda_2)$. This finishes the proof of Theorem A. $\square$

4 Non-hyperbolicity implies existence of weak periodic orbits: proof of Theorem B

This section will give the proof of Theorem B. We assume that $\mathcal{R}$ is the residual set of $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ stated in Lemma 2.34 and $f \in \mathcal{R}$ is a diffeomorphism that satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem B. Later we will assume also that f belongs to another two residual subsets $\mathcal{R}_0$ and $\mathcal{R}_1$ defined below.

Since $E \oplus F$ is a dominated splitting and $dimE \leq ind(p)$, we have that: there are $\lambda_0 \in (0,1)$ and $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that, for any $m \geq m_0$, the splitting $E \oplus F$ is (m, λ_0^2)-dominated, and, for the hyperbolic periodic orbit $orb(p)$,

$$\|Df^{\tau(p)}|_{E(p)}\| < \lambda_0^{\tau(p)},$$

where $\tau(p)$ is the period of $orb(p)$. In the following, we fix $m \geq m_0$. In order to simplify the notations, we will assume that $m = 1$ and that p is a fixed point of f, but the general case is identical.

4.1 Existence of weak sets

Lemma 4.1. *For any $\lambda \in (\lambda_0, 1)$, there is a λ-E-weak set contained in $H(p)$.*

Proof. Since E is not contracted, there is a point $b \in H(p)$, such that, for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i(b))}\| \geq 1.$$

Then the first assumption for the bundle E in Lemma 2.22 is satisfied.

Assume by contradiction that there is a constant $\lambda \in (\lambda_0, 1)$, such that there is no λ-E-weak set contained in $H(p)$. Thus the seconde assumption in Lemma 2.22 is satisfied for the bundle E and the constant λ. Hence, for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (\lambda, 1)$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, there is a sequence of periodic orbits $orb(q_k)$ with period $\tau(q_k)$ that are homoclinically related with each other and that converges to a subset of $H(p)$ such that for any $k \geq 0$, the following properties are satisfied:

$${\lambda_1}^{\tau(q_k)} \leq \prod_{0 \leq i < \tau(q_k)} \|Df|_{E(f^i(q_k))}\| \leq {\lambda_2}^{\tau(q_k)},$$

Then $H(p) = H(q_k)$ by item 2 of Lemma 2.34, hence $q_k \in H(p)$. It is obvious that $orb(q_k)$ is a λ_1-E-weak set contained in $H(p)$, thus is also a λ-E-weak set. This contradicts the assumption that there is no λ-E-weak set contained in $H(p)$. $\square$

4.2 Existence of a bi-Pliss point accumulating backward to an E-weak set

From now on, we fix any two numbers $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ in $(\lambda_0, 1)$. Then there is a λ_2-E-weak set contained in $H(p)$. By the domination, any λ_2-E-weak set K is (C, λ_0, F)-expanded for some constant $C > 0$ depending on K. By [31], any point $x \in K$ has a uniform local unstable manifold $W^u_{loc}(x)$ with a uniform size depending on K.

We extend the dominated splitting $E \oplus F$ to the maximal invariant compact set of a small neighborhood U of $H(p)$ and denote it still by $E \oplus F$. We take a constant $\lambda_3 \in (\lambda_2, 1)$.

Lemma 4.2. *There are a λ_2-E-weak set K, and a λ_3-bi-Pliss point $x \in H(p) \setminus K$ satisfying: $\alpha(x) = K$.*

It is obvious that any compact invariant subset of a λ_2-E-weak set is still a λ_2-E-weak set. So we only have to prove that: *there are a λ_2-E-weak set K, and a λ_3-bi-Pliss point $x \in H(p) \setminus K$ satisfying: $\alpha(x) \subset K$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, there exists a λ_2-E-weak set in $H(p)$. To prove this lemma, we consider two cases: either all the λ_2-E-weak sets are uniformly E-weak or not. More precisely, if we take the closure of the union of all λ_2-E-weak sets contained in $H(p)$, and denote it by $\hat{K}$, then there are two cases: either $\hat{K}$ is still a λ_2-E-weak set or not.

4.2.1 The uniform case: $\hat{K}$ is a λ_2-E-weak set

In this case, $\hat{K}$ is the maximal λ_2-E-weak set in $H(p)$ and we will take $K = \hat{K}$.

Claim 4.3. *K is locally maximal in $H(p)$.*

Proof. We prove by contradiction. Assume that K is not locally maximal in $H(p)$. Take a decreasing sequence of neighborhoods $(U_n)_{n\geq 0}$ of K, such that $\cap_n U_n = K$. Then for any $n \geq 0$, there is a compact invariant set $K_n \subset U_n \cap H(p)$ such that $K \subsetneqq K_n$. Since K is the maximal λ_2-E-weak set in $H(p)$, we have that K_n is not a λ_2-E-weak set, thus there is a λ_2-E-Pliss point $y_n \in K_n$. Take a converging subsequence of (y_n), and assume y is the limit point. Then we have that $y \in K$ and y is a λ_2-E-Pliss point. This contradicts the fact that K is a λ_2-E-weak set. ☐

Since K is locally maximal in $H(p)$, there is a neighborhood U of K such that K is the maximal compact invariant set contained in $U \cap H(p)$. Then there is a point $z \in (U \cap H(p)) \setminus K$, such that $\alpha(z) \subset K$.

Claim 4.4. *There exists at least one λ_2-E-Pliss point contained in $\omega(z)$.*

Proof. We proof this claim by absurd. If $\omega(z)$ contains no λ_2-E-Pliss points, by item (1) of Corollary 2.19, $orb(z) \cup \omega(z)$ contains no λ_2-E-Pliss points. Then $K \cup orb(z) \cup \omega(z)$ is a λ_2-E-weak set, which contradicts the maximality of λ_2-E-weak set K since $z \notin K$. Thus $\omega(z)$ contains at least one λ_2-E-Pliss point. ☐

Since K is a λ_2-E-weak set, by the domination, for any point $w \in K$, there is an integer n_w, such that $\prod_{i=0}^{n_w-1} \|Df^{-1}|_{F(f^{-i}(w))}\| \leq \left(\frac{\lambda_0^2}{\lambda_2}\right)^{n_w} < {\lambda_0}^{n_w}$. By item 2 of Corollary 2.19, considering the bundle F, there are infinitely many λ_1-F-Pliss points for f^{-1} on $orb^-(z)$. We take all the λ_1-F-Pliss points $\{f^{n_i}(z)\}$ with $n_{i+1} > n_i$ on $orb(z)$ and consider the following two cases:

- **(a)** either the sequence (n_i) has an upper bound or $(n_{i+1} - n_i)$ can be arbitrarily large;
- **(b)** the sequence (n_i) has no upper bounds and $(n_{i+1} - n_i)$ is bounded.

Claim 4.5. *In case **(a)**, there exists a λ_2-E-Pliss point $y \in H(p)$, such that, for any $\delta > 0$, there is $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, satisfying $d(y, f^{n_i}(z)) < \delta$. Thus, by taking δ small enough, we can take $x \in W^u(f^{n_i}(z)) \cap W^s(y)$, such that x is a λ_3-bi-Pliss point.*

Proof. If the sequence $\{n_i\}$ has an upper bound, we take the maximal n_i. That is to say, $f^{n_i}(z)$ is a λ_1-F-Pliss point for f^{-1}, and, there is no λ_1-F-Pliss point for f^{-1} on $orb^+(f^{n_i}(z))$. By item 3 of Lemma 2.21, we have that $f^{n_i}(z)$ is also a λ_1-E-Pliss point, thus $f^{n_i}(z)$ is a λ_1-bi-Pliss point. We take $x = y = f^{n_i}(z)$ in this case.

Otherwise, the sequence $\{n_i\}$ has no upper bounds but $(n_{i+1} - n_i)$ can be arbitrarily large. By item 1 of Lemma 2.21, we can take a subsequence of $\{n_i\}$ such that $f^{n_i}(z)$ converges to a λ_1-bi-Pliss point $y \in \omega(z)$. Then for any $\delta > 0$, we can take n_i large enough, such that $d(y, f^{n_i}(z)) < \delta$, and moreover, we can take $x \in W^u(f^{n_i}z) \cap W^s(y)$, such that, $d(f^j(x), f^j(y)) < \delta$ and $d(f^{-j}(x), f^{-j}(f^{n_i}z)) < \delta$, for all $j \geq 0$. Thus by taking taking δ small enough, x is a λ_3-bi-Pliss point. ☐

Claim 4.6. *In case **(b)**, there is a λ_2-E-Pliss point $y \in \omega(z)$, such that, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfying $W^u(f^n(z)) \cap W^s(y) \neq \emptyset$. Thus we can take a point $x \in W^u(f^n(z)) \cap W^s(y)$, such that $orb(x)$ contains some λ_3-bi-Pliss point.*

Proof. In this case, there are infinitely many λ_1-F-Pliss points for f^{-1} on $orb^+(z)$, and the time between any consecutive λ_1-F-Pliss points for f^{-1} on $orb^+(z)$ is bounded. Then for any point $w \in \overline{orb^+(z)}$, there is an integer $n_w \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\prod_{i=0}^{n_w-1} \|Df^{-1}|_{E(f^{-i}(w))}\| \leq \lambda^{n_w}$. Hence $\overline{orb^+(z)}$ is a positive invariant F-expanded compact set, and any point $w \in \overline{orb^+(z)}$ has a uniform unstable manifold. By Claim 4.4, there is a λ_2-E-Pliss point $y \in \omega(z)$. For any $\delta > 0$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that, $d(y, f^n(z)) < \delta$, and $W^u(f^n(z)) \cap W^s(y) \neq \emptyset$. We take $x \in W^s(y) \cap W^u(f^n(z))$. Then $\alpha(x) = \alpha(z)$ and by item 2 of Corollary 2.19, there are λ_3-F-Pliss points for f^{-1} on $orb^-(x)$. Also by taking δ small enough, $d(f^i(x), f^i(y))$ can be small for all $i \geq 0$. Since y is a λ_2-E-Pliss point, we can take x to be a λ_3-E-Pliss point. Then, by item 2 of Lemma 2.21 there exists a λ_3-bi-Pliss point on $orb(x)$, we assume that x is such a point. ☐

From the above two claims, we get a λ_3-bi-Pliss point $x \in H(p)$, such that $\alpha(x) \subset K$. We have to show that $x \notin K$. Notice that in the two cases, we both have $\omega(x) = \omega(y)$ where y is a λ_2-E-Pliss point. By item 1 of Corollary 2.19, $\omega(x)$ contains some λ_2-E-Pliss point. Since K contains no λ_2-E-Pliss point, we have that $x \notin K$.

4.2.2 The non-uniform case: $\hat{K}$ is not a λ_2-E-weak set

Claim 4.7. *In this case, for any number $L > 0$ there are a λ_2-E-weak set K and a point $z \in K$, such that z is a λ_1-F-Pliss point for f^{-1}, and, $N_z > L$, where N_z is taken as in Definition 2.16.*

Proof. Since $\hat{K}$ is not a λ_2-E-weak set, then for any number $L > 0$ there is a λ_2-E-weak sets K, and a point $z \in K$, such that $N_z > L$, that is to say, for $1 \le n \le N_z$,

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i(z))}\| \le \lambda_2^n,$$

and

$$\prod_{i=0}^{N_z-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i(z))}\| > \lambda_2^{N_z}.$$

We only have to show that we can choose z to be a λ_1-F-Pliss point for f^{-1}. Since K is a λ_2-E-weak set, similarly to the arguments above, by item 2 of Corollary 2.19, there are λ_1-F-Pliss points for f^{-1} on $orb^-(z)$. If z is not a λ_1-F-Pliss point for f^{-1}, we can take the minimal number $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $w = f^{-l}(z)$ is a λ_1-F-Pliss point for f^{-1}. We claim that $N_w \ge N_z + l > L$. Hence if we replace z by w, we get the conclusion of the claim. To proof this, we only have to show that for any $1 \le n \le l$,

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i(w))}\| \le \lambda_2^n.$$

We prove this by absurd. If the above statement is not true, then there is an integer $k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, l\}$, such that

$$\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i(w))}\| > \lambda_2^k,$$

and for any $1 \le n < k$,

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i(w))}\| \le \lambda_2^n.$$

Thus, we have, for any $1 \le n \le k$,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} \|Df|_{E(f^{k-i}(w))}\| = \left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i(w))}\|\right) / \left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-n-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i(w))}\|\right) > \lambda_2^n.$$

By the domination of $E \oplus F$, we have, for all $1 \le n \le k$

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df^{-1}|_{F(f^{k-i}(w))}\| \le (\frac{\lambda_0^2}{\lambda_2})^n \le \lambda_1^n.$$

Moreover, since w is a λ_1-F-Pliss point for f^{-1}, we will have, for any $n \ge 1$,

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \|Df^{-1}|_{F(f^{k-i}(w))}\| \le \lambda_1^n.$$

Thus $f^k(w) = f^{-l+k}(z)$ is a λ_1-F-Pliss point, contradicting the choice of w. This finishes the proof of Claim 4.7. ☐

By taking L large enough, the point z in Claim 4.7 can be arbitrarily close to a λ_2-E-Pliss point $y \notin K$. Since z has a uniform local unstable manifold and y has a uniform local stable manifold, when we take these two points close enough, $W^s(y) \cap W^u(z) \neq \emptyset$. Similar to the arguments in the proof of Case **(b)** of **Case 1**, we can take a λ_3-bi-Pliss point $x \in W^s(y) \cap W^u(z)$ such that, $x \in H(p) \setminus K$ and $\alpha(x) \subset K$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.2. □

4.3 Continuation of Pliss points

Denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the space of all finite subsets of M and by $\mathcal{M}$ the space of all compact subsets of M, associated with the Hausdorff topology. Denote by $\mathcal{S}$ the space of all finite subsets of $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{M}$ associated with the Hausdorff topology. For any positive integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and a diffeomorphism $g \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, denote by $Per_N(g)$ the set of periodic points of g with period less than or equal to N, and denote by $\mathcal{C}(q, g)$ the chain recurrence class of a periodic point q of g. It is well known that for any $N \geq 1$, there is a dense and open subset $\mathcal{U}_N \subset \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, such that, for any $g \in \mathcal{U}_N$, the set $Per_N(g)$ is a finite set and any point $q \in Per_N(g)$ is a hyperbolic periodic point.

We define a map $\Phi_N : \mathcal{U}_N \mapsto \mathcal{S}$, sending a diffeomorphism g to the set of pairs $(q, P_{\lambda_3}(q, g))$, where $q \in Per_N(g)$, and $P_{\lambda_3}(q, g)$ is a compact set contained in $\mathcal{C}(q, g)$ defined as following:

- The set $P_{\lambda_3}(q, g)$ is the set of λ_3-E-Pliss points contained in $\mathcal{C}(q, g)$, if $\mathcal{C}(q, g)$ has a λ_0^2-dominated splitting $E \oplus F$ such that $dim(E) = ind(q)$.
- The set $P_{\lambda_3}(q, g) = \emptyset$ if otherwise.

Lemma 4.8. *For each positive integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the set of continuity points of Φ_N, denoted by $\mathcal{B}_N$, is a residual subset of* $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$.

Proof. Assume $g \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ and p_g is a hyperbolic periodic point of g. There is a C^1-neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of g, such that, for any $h \in \mathcal{U}$, the point p_g has a continuation p_h. For any neighborhood V of $\mathcal{C}(q, g)$, there is a C^1-neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_1 \subset \mathcal{U}$ of g, such that $\mathcal{C}(q, h) \subset V$ for any $h \in \mathcal{U}_1$.

If $\mathcal{C}(q, g)$ has a λ_0^2-dominated splitting, then it is a robust λ_0^2-dominated splitting. More precisely, there is a C^1-neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_2 \subset \mathcal{U}$ of g, such that $\mathcal{C}(q_h, h)$ has a λ_0^2-dominated splitting for any $h \in \mathcal{U}$. Hence by the choice of $\mathcal{U}_N$, there is an open and dense subset $\mathcal{U}_N' \subset \mathcal{U}_N$, such that, for any $g \in \mathcal{U}_N'$, any $q \in Per_N(g)$, the chain recurrent class $\mathcal{C}(q, g)$ either has a robust λ_0^2-dominated splitting or has no λ_0^2-dominated splitting robustly. Moreover, if there is a sequence of diffeomorphisms $\{g_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ such that g_n converges to g, and g_n has a λ_3-E-Pliss point $x_n \in \mathcal{C}(q_h, h)$, then, any limit point x of the sequence $\{x_n\}$ is a λ_3-E-Pliss point of g.

By the above arguments, we can see that Φ_N is an upper-semi-continuous map restricted to $\mathcal{U}_N'$. It is known that the set of continuity points of a semi-continuous map is a residual subset. Then $\mathcal{B}_N$ contained a residual subset of $\mathcal{U}_N'$. Since $\mathcal{U}_N'$ is open and dense in $\mathcal{U}_N$, we know that $\mathcal{B}_N$ is a residual subset of $\mathcal{U}_N$. Hence $\mathcal{B}_N$ is a residual subset of $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, since $\mathcal{U}_N$ is open and dense in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. □

Denote by $\mathcal{R}_0 = \cap_{N \geq 1} \mathcal{B}_N$, then $\mathcal{R}_0$ is a residual subset of $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. In the following we take $f \in \mathcal{R}_0 \cap \mathcal{R}$.

4.4 The perturbation to make $W^u(p)$ accumulate to K

We take the λ_2-E-weak set $K \subset H(p)$ of f obtained by Lemma 4.2. By proposition 2, one can obtain a heteroclinic orbit connecting p to K by a C^1 perturbation, since $K \subset H(p)$. Hence the set K is still a λ_2-E-weak set if the perturbation is C^1 small. Moreover, using the continuation of Pliss points (Section 4.2 and 4.3), we can guarantee that the set K is contained in the chain recurrence class of p after the perturbation.

Lemma 4.9. *Assume $f \in \mathcal{R}_0 \cap \mathcal{R}$, then for any neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, there are a diffeomorphism $g_1 \in \mathcal{U}$ and a point $y \in M$, such that,*

- *(1) g_1 coincides with f on the set $K \cup orb(p)$, and $y \in W^u(p, g_1)$,*
- *(2) $\omega(y, g_1) \subset K$,*
- *(3) K is contained in $\mathcal{C}(p, g_1)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, we obtain that, for the diffeomorphism f, there is a λ_3-bi-Pliss point $x \in H(p) \setminus K$ satisfying: $\alpha(x) = K$. Since $K \subset H(p)$, we have that $K \subset \overline{W^u(p)}$. By Proposition 2, for any neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, there are a point $y \in W^u(p, f)$ and a diffeomorphism $g_1 \in \mathcal{U}$, such that $\omega(y, g_1) \subset K$, and $y \in W^u(p, g_1)$. Moreover, the diffeomorphism g_1 coincides with f on the set $orb^-(x) \cup K \cup orb(p)$ and Dg_1 coincides with Df on $orb^-(x)$. Thus items (1) and (2) are satisfied, and x is a λ_3-F-Pliss point for g_1^{-1}.

Since p is a hyperbolic fixed point and and $x \in P_{\lambda_3}(p, f)$, by Lemma 4.8 and the fact that f is a continuity point of Φ_1, if we choose g_1 close enough to f (by taking the neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ small), then there is a λ_3-E-Pliss x' close to x, such that $x' \in \mathcal{C}(p, g_1)$. Moreover, if x' is close enough to x (by taking g_1 close to f), then $W^u(x, g_1) \cap W^s(x', g_1) \neq \emptyset$. Hence $K \subset \mathcal{C}(p, g_1)$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.9. □

4.5 The perturbations to connect p and K by true orbits

In this subsection, we prove that we can get heteroclinic connections between the hyperbolic fixed point p and the weak set K for a diffeomorphism C^1 close to f. In the former subsection, we have got a diffeomorphism g_1 that is C^1 close to f, and an orbit $orb(y)$ that connects p to K. Moreover K is still contained in the chain recurrence class of p for g_1. We take two steps to get heteroclinic connections between p and K. First, since $K \subset \mathcal{C}(p, g_1)$, by Proposition 3, we can connect K by a true orbit to any neighborhood of p by a C^1 small perturbation. Then, by the hyperbolicity of p, we use the uniform connecting lemma to "push" this orbit onto the stable manifold of p. We will see that in these two steps, the orbit $orb(y)$ that connects p to K is not changed.

Lemma 4.10. *Assume $f \in \mathcal{R}_0 \cap \mathcal{R}$, then for any neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, there are a diffeomorphism $g_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ and two points $y, y' \in M$, such that,*

- *(1) $y \in W^u(p, g_2)$ and $\omega(y, g_2) \subset K$,*
- *(2) $y' \in W^s(p, g_2)$ and $\alpha(y', g_2) \subset \omega(y, g_2)$,*
- *(3) g_2 coincides with f on the set $\omega(y, g_2) \cup orb(p)$.*

Proof. We take several steps to prove the lemma.

Choice of neighborhoods. For any any neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, there are a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_1 \subset \mathcal{U}$ and three numbers $\rho > 1$, $\delta_0 > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ that satisfy the uniform connecting lemma (Theorem 2.23). And we can assume that the fixed point p has a continuation for any $g \in \mathcal{U}_1$. For the neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_1$, there are a smaller neighborhood $\mathcal{U}' \subset \mathcal{U}_1$ of f and an integer T satisfying the conclusions of Proposition 3. By the hyperbolicity of periodic orbits of f, for the integer T, there is a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_2 \subset \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ of f, such that, for any diffeomorphism $h \in \mathcal{U}_2$, any periodic point of h with period less than or equal to T is hyperbolic. Take a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_3$ of f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, such that $\overline{\mathcal{U}_3} \subset \mathcal{U}_2 \cap \mathcal{U}'$.

The connection from K to a neighborhood of p by pseudo-orbits. By Lemma 4.9, there are a diffeomorphism $g_1 \in \mathcal{U}_3$ and a point $y \in M$, such that:

- g_1 coincides with f on the set $K \cup orb(p) \cup orb^-(y)$,
- $y \in W^u(p, g_1)$ and $\omega(y, g_1) \subset K \subset \mathcal{C}(p, g_1)$.

Denote $K_0 = \omega(y, g_1)$.

Claim 4.11. *For any neighborhood V of p, there are a g_1 negative invariant compact set X and a point $z \in V \cap X$, satisfying that*

- *the point $p \notin X$,*
- *for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a g_1-ε-pseudo-orbit $Y_\varepsilon = (y_0, \cdots, y_m)$ contained in X such that $y_0 \in K_0$ and $y_m = z$.*

Proof. For any neighborhood V of p, take a smaller neighborhood V_0 of p, such that $\overline{V_0} \subset V$. For any $k \geq 1$, there is a g_1-$\frac{1}{k}$-pseudo-orbit $X_k = \{x_0^k, x_1^k, \cdots, x_{m_k}^k\}$, such that, $X_k \cap K_0 = \{x_0^k\}$, and $X_k \cap V_0 = \{x_{m_k}^k\}$. Take a subsequence of $\{X_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ if necessary, we assume X_k converges to a compact set X and $x_{m_k}^k$ converges to a point $z \in \overline{V_0} \subset V$ as k goes to $+\infty$. Obviously, X is a g_1-negative-invariant set, $p \notin X$ and $X \cap K_0 \neq \emptyset$.

Now we prove that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a g_1-ε-pseudo-orbit contained in X from K_0 to z. By the continuity of g_1, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $k > \frac{3}{\varepsilon}$, such that for all $x, y \in M$, if $d(x, y) < \frac{1}{k}$, then $d(g_1(x), g_1(y)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$. Then we take a $\frac{1}{k'}$-pseudo-orbit $X_{k'} = \{x_0^{k'}, x_1^{k'}, \cdots, x_{m_k}^{k'}\}$, such that $x_0^{k'} \in K_0$ and $x_{m_{k'}}^{k'} \in V_0$ for a number $k' > k$. By choosing k' large enough, we can assume that $d_H(X_{k'}, X) < \frac{1}{k}$ and there is a point $y_0 \in X \cap K_0$ such that $d(y_0, x_0^{k'}) < \frac{1}{k}$ and $d(z, x_{m_{k'}}^{k'}) < \frac{1}{k}$. By the assumption, for any $1 \leq i \leq m_{k'} - 1$, there is $y_i \in X$, such that $d(x_i^{k'}, y_i) < \eta$. Denote $Y_\varepsilon = (y_0, \cdots, y_{m_{k'}} = z)$, we prove that Y_ε is a ε-pseudo-orbit of g_1. In fact, for any $0 \leq i \leq m_{k'} - 1$,

$$d(g_1(y_i), y_{i+1}) \leq d(g_1(y_i), g_1(x_i^{k'})) + d(g_1(x_i^{k'}), x_{i+1}^{k'}) + d(x_{i+1}^{k'}, y_{i+1}) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{1}{k'} + \frac{1}{k} < \varepsilon.$$

Hence $Y_\varepsilon \subset X$ is a ε-pseudo-orbit of g_1 from the set K_0 to the point z. $\square$

The perturbation to connect K to a neighborhood of p. We take a local stable manifold $W^s_{loc}(p, g_1)$ of p, and take a compact fundamental domain I_{g_1} of $W^s_{loc}(p, g_1)$. Then there is a number $\delta < \delta_0$, such that, for any point $w \in I_{g_1}$, the N balls $(g_1^j(B(w, 2\delta)))_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ are each of size smaller than δ_0, pairwise disjoint and disjoint with the set $K \cup orb(y, g_1) \cup orb(p)$. By the compactness of I_{g_1}, there are finite points $w_1, w_2, \cdots, w_L \in I_{g_1}$ such that $(B(w_i, \delta/\rho))_{1 \leq i \leq L}$ is a finite open cover of I_{g_1}. There is a number $\eta > 0$ such that, for any diffeomorphism $h \in \mathcal{U}_1$ that is η-C^0 close to g_1, we have that:

- (a) $W^s_{loc}(p_h, h)$ is C^0 close to $W^s_{loc}(p, g_1)$,
- (b) $(B(w_i, \delta/\rho))_{1 \leq i \leq L}$ is still a finite open cover of a fundamental domain I_h of $W^s_{loc}(p_h, h)$
- (c) for any $1 \leq i \leq L$, the N balls $(h^j(B(w_i, 2\delta))_{0 \leq j \leq N-1}$ are each of size smaller than δ_0, pairwise disjoint and disjoint with the set $K \cup orb(y, g_1) \cup orb(p, g_1)$.

Since $y \in W^u(p, g_1)$, $p \notin X$ and X is negative invariant, we have that $orb(y, g_1) \cap X = \emptyset$. By the choice of g_1, we have that all periodic orbits of g_1 contained in X with period less than or equal to T are hyperbolic. Under all these hypothesis, $(X \setminus K_0) \cap \overline{orb(y, g_1)} = \emptyset$, then there is a neighborhood U_0 of $X \setminus K_0$ such that $U_0 \cap \overline{orb(y, g_1)} = \emptyset$. By Proposition 3, there is a diffeomorphism $h \in \mathcal{U}_1$ which is η-C^0 close to g_1, such that $h = g_1 = f|_{P \cup orb(y) \cup K_0}$, and $\alpha(z, h) \subset K_0$. Thus the above items (a), (b) and (c) are satisfied for such a diffeomorphism h.

The perturbation to get a heteroclinic connection between p and K. By the hyperbolicity of the periodic point p, if we take the neighborhood V of p small enough, then the diffeomorphism h and the point z chosen above would satisfy that the negative orbit of z under h intersect $B(w_i, \delta/\rho)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}$. Since $\alpha(z, h) \subset K_0$ and $B(w_i, \delta/\rho) \cap K_0 = \emptyset$, there is a point $w = h^{-t}(z)$ for some integer $t > 0$, such that $orb^-(w) \cap B(w_i, \delta/\rho) = \emptyset$ and w has a positive iterate under h contained in $B(w_i, \delta/\rho)$. By the item (b), there is a point $y' \in W^s(p, h)$, such that $orb^+(y', h) \cap (\cup_{0 \le j \le N-1} h^i(B(w_i, \delta/\rho))) = \emptyset$ and y' has a negative iterate under h contained in $B(w_i, \delta/\rho)$. By Theorem 2.23, there is a diffeomorphism $g_2 \in \mathcal{U}$, such that y' is on the positive iterate of w under g_2. Moreover, $g_2 = g_1$ on the set $K_0 \cup orb(y) \cup orb(p) \cup orb^-(w) \cup orb^+(y')$, hence $g_2 = f$ on the set $orb(p) \cup K_0$, where $K_0 = \omega(y, g_1) = \omega(y, g_2)$. Thus the three items of the lemma are satisfied for g_2. This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.10. $\square$

4.6 Last perturbation to get a weak periodic orbit

The following lemma estimates the average contraction along the bundle E on periodic orbits.

Lemma 4.12. *Assume $f \in \mathcal{R}_0 \cap \mathcal{R}$. Then for any neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, for any integer $L > 0$, any neighborhood U_p of p, there is $g \in \mathcal{U}$, which coincides with f on $orb(p)$, satisfying that, g has a periodic point $q \in U_p$ with period $\tau > L$ such that, $orb(q)$ has the λ_0^2-dominated splitting $E \oplus F$, and*

$$\lambda_1{}^{\tau} \le \prod_{0 \le i \le \tau-1} \|Dg|_{E(g^i(q))}\| \le \lambda_2{}^{\tau}.$$

Proof. We take several steps to prove the lemma. We take the λ_2-E-weak set $K \subset H(p)$ of f obtained by Lemma 4.2. Take two numbers λ_1' and λ_2', such that $\lambda_1 < \lambda_1' < \lambda_2' < \lambda_2$.

Choice of neighborhoods and constants. There is a neighborhood V of $H(p)$ and a neighborhood $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ of f, such that, for any $h \in \mathcal{V}$, the following properties are satisfied.

- The maximal invariant compact set of h in V has a dominated splitting which is a continuation of $E \oplus F$. To simplify the notations, we still denote this domination by $E \oplus F$.
- The fixed point p has a continuation $p_h \in V$ for h, and $\|Dh|_{E(p_h)}\| < \lambda_0$.
- The chain recurrence class $\mathcal{C}(p_h, h)$ of p_h is contained in V.

Moreover, since K is a λ_2-E-weak set for f, there are a neighborhood $U_K \subset V$ of K and a number N_K, such that, for any point z whose orbit is contained in V, if the piece of orbit

$(z, f(z), \cdots, f^n(z))$ is contained in $\overline{U_K}$ with $n \geq N_K$, we have:

$$\prod_{0\leq i\leq n-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i(z))}\| > {\lambda_2}^n.$$

To simplify the proof, we just assume that $N_K = 1$, but the general case is identical.

We can take the neighborhoods $\mathcal{V}$ and U_p small, such that for any diffeomorphism $h \in \mathcal{V}$, the following additional properties are satisfied.

- For any point $z \in U_p$ whose orbit under h is contained in V, we have that $\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1'} < \frac{\|Dh|_{E(z)}\|}{\|Df|_{E(p)}\|} < \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_2'}$.
- For any point $z \in U_K$ whose orbit under h is contained in V, we have that $\|Dh|_{E(z)}\| > \lambda_2$.

We can assume more that $\overline{U_K} \cap \overline{U_p} = \emptyset$ and $\overline{U_K} \cup \overline{U_p} \subset V$. And moreover, we can assume that $\overline{\mathcal{U}} \subset \mathcal{V}$.

By Lemma 4.10, there are a diffeomorphism $g_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ and two points $y, y' \in M$, satisfying that:

- $y \in W^u(p, g_2)$ and $\omega(y, g_2) \subset K$,
- $y' \in W^s(p, g_2)$ and $\alpha(y', g_2) \subset \omega(y, g_2)$,
- g_2 coincides with f on the set $\omega(y, g_2) \cup orb(p)$.

We denote $K_0 = \omega(y, g_2)$. Since all periodic points of f are hyperbolic and $g_2 = f|_{K_0}$, then by a C^1 small perturbation if necessary, we can assume that K_0 contains no non-hyperbolic periodic point of g_2.

Choice of time. Now we fix the neighborhoods U_p and U_{K_0}. Then there are two integers l and n_0 satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 1 for g_2 and the neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$. Then we take $T_{K_0} > L$ large, such that for any $h \in \mathcal{V}$, the inequality

$$m(h)^{l+n_0} {\lambda_2}^{T_{K_0}} > (\lambda_2')^{T_{K_0}+l+n_0}$$

holds.

By the first item of Proposition 1, there is a diffeomorphism $h \in \mathcal{U}$, such that

- h coincides with g_2 on $orb(p) \cup orb^-(y) \cup orb^+(y')$ and outside U_K;
- the point y' is on the positive orbit of y under h, with $n_{K_0} = \sharp(orb(y, h) \cap U_{K_0}) \geq T_{K_0}$ and $n_c = \sharp((orb(y, h) \setminus (U_K \cup U_p)) \leq n_0$.

Hence by the choice of T_{K_0} and the neighborhoods, we have that

$$\prod_{h^i(y)\notin U_p} \|Dh|_{E(h^i(x))}\| > (\lambda_2')^{n_{K_0}+n_c}.$$

Claim 4.13. *There is an integer $m > 0$, such that:*

$$(\lambda_1')^{n_{K_0}+n_c+m+l} < \|Df|_{E(p)}\|^{l+m} \cdot \prod_{h^i(y)\notin U_p} \|Dh|_{E(h^i(x))}\| < (\lambda_2')^{n_{K_0}+n_c+m+l}.$$

Proof. We assume that

$$\prod_{h^i(y)\notin U_p} \|Dh|_{E(h^i(x))}\| = \bar{\lambda}^{n_{K_0}+n_c},$$

then $\bar{\lambda} > \lambda_2'$. The inequality in the claim is equivalent to

$$\frac{(n_{K_0}+n_c)\log\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda_2'}}{\log\frac{\lambda_2'}{\|Df|_{E(p)}\|}} < l+m < \frac{(n_{K_0}+n_c)\log\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda_1'}}{\log\frac{\lambda_1'}{\|Df|_{E(p)}\|}}.$$

By the choice of T_{K_0} and $n_{K_0} \geq T_{K_0}$, we have that

$$\frac{(n_{K_0}+n_c)\log\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda_2'}}{\log\frac{\lambda_2'}{\|Df|_{E(p)}\|}} > l.$$

So we only need that

$$\frac{(n_{K_0}+n_c)\log\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda_1'}}{\log\frac{\lambda_1'}{\|Df|_{E(p)}\|}} - \frac{(n_{K_0}+n_c)\log\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda_2'}}{\log\frac{\lambda_2'}{\|Df|_{E(p)}\|}} > 1.$$

It is equivalent to

$$(n_{K_0}+n_c)\left((\frac{1}{\log\frac{\lambda_1'}{\|Df|_{E(p)}\|}} - \frac{1}{\log\frac{\lambda_2'}{\|Df|_{E(p)}\|}})\log\bar{\lambda} + \frac{\log\lambda_2'}{\log\frac{\lambda_2'}{\|Df|_{E(p)}\|}} - \frac{\log\lambda_1'}{\log\frac{\lambda_1'}{\|Df|_{E(p)}\|}} \right) > 1.$$

Since $\bar{\lambda} > \lambda_2'$, and $n_{K_0} > T_{K_0}$, it is sufficient to acquire that

$$\frac{T_{K_0}(\log\lambda_2' - \log\lambda_1')}{\log\frac{\lambda_1'}{\|Df|_{E(p)}\|}} > 1.$$

By taking T_{K_0} large enough, the above inequality is satisfied. □

Choice of the diffeomorphism g. We take $g = h_m \in \mathcal{U}$ from item 2 of Proposition 1, then g has a periodic orbit $O = orb(q)$, such that, $O \setminus U_p = (orb(y,h) \setminus U_p$, and $\sharp(O \cap U_p) = l+m$. Hence the period τ of O equals $n_{K_0}+n_c+m+l$. By the choice of the neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ and the constants, we have

$$\prod_{0\leq i\leq \tau-1} \|Dg|_{E(g^i(q))}\| = \prod_{g^i(q)\in U_p} \|Dg|_{E(g^i(q))}\| \prod_{h^i(y)\notin U_p} \|Dh|_{E(h^i(x))}\|.$$

By the choice of the neighborhoods $\mathcal{V}$ and U_p, and the constants λ_1' and λ_2', we have that

$$\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1'}\right)^{l+m} \|Df|_{E(p)}\|^{l+m} < \prod_{g^i(q)\in U_p} \|Dg|_{E(g^i(q))}\| < \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_2'}\right)^{l+m} \|Df|_{E(p)}\|^{l+m}.$$

Then by the estimation in Claim 4.13, we can see that

$$\lambda_1{}^{\tau} \leq \prod_{0\leq i\leq \tau-1} \|Dg|_{E(g^i(q))}\| \leq \lambda_2{}^{\tau}$$

This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.12. □

4.7 The genericity argument

In this subsection, we do the genericity argument to get the conclusion of Theorem B, see like [25].

Take a countable basis $(V_n)_{n\geq 1}$ of M, and take the countable family $(U_n)_{n\geq 1}$, where each U_n is a union of finitely many sets of $(V_n)_{n\geq 1}$. Take the countable pairs $(\eta_n, \gamma_n)_{n\geq 1}$ of rational numbers contained in $(\lambda_0, 1)$ with $\eta_n < \gamma_n$ for each $n \geq 1$.

Let $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}$ be the set of C^1 diffeomorphisms h such that, every h_1 in a C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ of h has a hyperbolic periodic point $q \in U_n$ satisfying that the hyperbolic splitting $E^s \oplus E^u$ of $orb(q, h_1)$ is a λ_0^2-dominated splitting and

$$\eta_m{}^{\tau(q)} < \prod_{0\leq i\leq \tau(q)-1} \|Dh_1|_{E^s(h_1^i)}\| < \gamma_m{}^{\tau(q)},$$

where $\tau(q)$ is the period of q. Let $\mathcal{N}_{n,m}$ be the set of C^1 diffeomorphisms h such that every h_1 in a C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ of h has no hyperbolic periodic point $q \in U_n$ satisfying that the hyperbolic splitting $E^s \oplus E^u$ of $orb(q, h_1)$ is a λ_0^2-dominated splitting and

$$\eta_m{}^{\tau(q)} < \prod_{0\leq i\leq \tau(q)-1} \|Dh_1|_{E^s(h_1^i)}\| < \gamma_m{}^{\tau(q)},$$

where $\tau(q)$ is the period of q.

Notice that $\mathcal{N}_{n,m} = \mathrm{Diff}^1(M) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{H}_{n,m}}$. Hence $\mathcal{H}_{n,m} \cup \mathcal{N}_{n,m}$ is C^1 open and dense in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. Let

$$\mathcal{R}_1 = \bigcap_{n\geq 1, m\geq 1} (\mathcal{H}_{n,m} \cup \mathcal{N}_{n,m}).$$

Then $\mathcal{R}_1$ is a residual subset of $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, and $\mathcal{R}_0 \cap \mathcal{R}_1 \cap \mathcal{R}$ is also a residual subset of $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$.

Claim 4.14. *Assume $f \in \mathcal{R}_0 \cap \mathcal{R}_1 \cap \mathcal{R}$. Then for any two numbers $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \in (\lambda_0, 1)$, for any neighborhood U_p of $orb(p)$, and any integer $L > 0$, there is a periodic point $q \in U_p$ with period $\tau > L$ such that $orb(q)$ has the λ_0^2-dominated splitting $E \oplus F$, and*

$$\lambda_1{}^{\tau} \leq \prod_{0\leq i\leq \tau-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i(q))}\| \leq \lambda_2{}^{\tau}.$$

Proof. We take two rational numbers $\eta_i, \gamma_i \in (\lambda_0, 1)$, such that $\lambda_1 < \eta_i < \gamma_i < \lambda_2$, and take U_j from the countable basis of M, such that $U_j \subset U_p$. Then by Lemma 4.12, there is a diffeomorphism g arbitrarily C^1 close to f, such that g has a periodic point $q \in U_p$ with period $\tau > T$ such that the λ_0^2-dominated splitting $E \oplus F$ is the hyperbolic splitting on $orb(q, g)$, and

$$\eta_i{}^{\tau} \leq \prod_{0\leq i\leq \tau-1} \|Dg|_{E(g^i(q))}\| \leq \gamma_i{}^{\tau}.$$

Then $f \notin \mathcal{N}_{j,i}$, thus $f \in \mathcal{H}_{j,i}$ and f satisfies the conclusion of Claim 4.14. ☐

Claim 4.15. *Theorem B holds for any diffeomorphisms in $\mathcal{R}_0 \cap \mathcal{R}_1 \cap \mathcal{R}$.*

Proof. Assume $f \in \mathcal{R}_0 \cap \mathcal{R}_1 \cap \mathcal{R}$ and f satisfies the assumptions of Theorem B. By Claim 4.14, we get a sequence of periodic orbits $orb(q_k)$ of f, such that $q_k \to p$ with $\tau(q_k) \to \infty$, and

$$\lambda_1{}^{\tau(q_k)} \leq \prod_{0 \leq i \leq \tau(q_k)-1} \|Df|_{E(f^i(q_k))}\| \leq \lambda_2{}^{\tau(q_k)}.$$

Hence by the λ_0^2-domination of $E \oplus F$, we have that

$$\prod_{0 \leq i \leq \tau(q_k)-1} \|Df^{-1}|_{F(f^{-i}(q_k))}\| \leq \lambda_2{}^{\tau(q_k)}.$$

Then by item 2 of Lemma 2.19 and item 2 of Lemma 2.21, there is a λ_2-bi-Pliss point r_k on $orb(q_k)$ for each k. Taking a subsequence if necessary, we assume (r_k) is a converging sequence. Then there is $l > 0$, such that for any $m, n \geq l$, the stable and unstable manifolds of r_m and r_n intersect respectively, since r_k has uniform stable and unstable manifolds. Hence $(orb(q_m))_{m \geq l}$ are homoclinically related together, thus $p \in H(q_k)$. By item 2 of Lemma 2.34, we have that $q_k \in H(p)$. This finishes the proof of the claim. ☐

The proof of Theorem B is now completed.

5 Periodic orbits around a periodic orbit and a set: proof of Proposition 1

In this section, we give the proof of Proposition 1. To simplify the notations, we assume that p is a hyperbolic fixed point of f, and the proof of the general case is similar. Since we want to get a periodic orbit that spends most of the time around $orb(p)$ and K, we just prove the proposition for U_p and U_K small. More precisely, we assume that $U_p \cap U_K = \emptyset$ and $x, y \notin U_K$. Moreover, by the hyperbolicity of periodic orbits in K, we assume that there are no periodic points with period less than or equal to N contained in $U_K \setminus K$.

Taking a smaller neighborhood if necessary, we assume that the element of $\mathcal{U}$ is of the form $f \circ \phi$ with $\phi \in \mathcal{V}$, where $\mathcal{V}$ is a C^1 neighborhood of Id and satisfies the property (F):
(F) For any perturbations ϕ and ϕ' of Id in $\mathcal{V}$ with disjoint support, the composed perturbation $\phi \circ \phi'$ is still in $\mathcal{V}$.
By the connecting lemma, there is an integer N associated to the neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$. By the Basic perturbation lemma, there are two numbers $\theta > 1$ and $r_0 > 0$ associated to $\mathcal{U}$.

Now we fix the neighborhoods $\mathcal{U}$, U_p and U_K, and the numbers N, θ and r_0.

5.1 The choice of n_0, the point z_1 and the perturbation domain at z_1.

Lemma 5.1. *There is a point $z_1 \in U_K \setminus K$, such that:*
– for any neighborhood V_{z_1} of z_1, there is $n \geq 1$ such that $f^n(x) \in V_{z_1}$;
– $z_1 \prec_{U_K} K$ and $orb^+(z_1) \subset U_K$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 2.13. We take a smaller open neighborhood V of K such that $\overline{V} \subset U_K$. Since $\omega(x) \cap K \neq \emptyset$, then for any $k \geq 1$, there is $n_k \geq 1$, such that $f^{n_k}(x) \in B(K, \frac{1}{k})$. Take the smallest integer m_k, such that the piece of orbit $(f^{m_k}(x), f^{m_k+1}(x), \cdots, f^{n_k}(x))$ is contained in V. Taking a converging subsequence if necessary, we assume that the sequence $\{f^{m_k}(x)\}_{k\geq 1}$ converges to a point $z_1 \in \overline{V} \subset U_K$ and the sequence $\{f^{n_k}(x)\}_{k\geq 1}$ converges to a point $z_2 \in K$. Then we have that $z_1 \prec_{U_K} z_2$, and the pieces of orbit that connects the neighborhoods of z_1 and z_2 are $(f^{m_k}(x), f^{m_k+1}(x), \cdots, f^{n_k}(x))_{k\geq 1}$. Since $z_2 \in K$, we have that $z_1 \prec_{U_K} K$. By the choice of m_k, we have that $f^{m_k-1}(x) \in M \setminus V$. Since $M \setminus V$ is compact, and $f^{-1}(z_1)$ is a limit point of the sequence $\{f^{m_k-1}(x)\}_{k\geq 1}$, we have that $f^{-1}(z) \in M \setminus V$. By the invariance of K, we have that $z_1 \notin K$ and $n_k - m_k$ goes to $+\infty$. Since $(f^{m_k}(x), f^{m_k+1}(x), \cdots, f^{n_k}(x))$ is contained in U_K and by the fact that $f^{m_k}(x)$ converges to z_1, we have that $orb^+(z_1) \subset \overline{V} \subset U_K$. Thus the second item is satisfied. The first item is a trivial fact by the choice of z_1. □

By the assumption on U_K, we have that z_1 is not a periodic point with period less than or equal to N. Also, since $y \in W^s(p)$, we have $z_1 \notin orb(y)$. Then there are two neighborhoods $V_{z_1} \subset U_{z_1}$ of z_1 satisfying the conclusion of the connecting lemma for the triple $(f, \mathcal{U}, N)$, and also satisfying the following conditions:

– $U_{z_1} \cup f(U_{z_1}) \cup \cdots \cup f^N(U_{z_1}) \subset U_K \setminus K$;

– $(U_{z_1} \cup f(U_{z_1}) \cup \cdots \cup f^N(U_{z_1})) \cap orb(y) = \emptyset$.

Then there is $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f^{n_1}(x) \in V_{z_1}$, and there is n_2, such that, for any $n \geq n_2$, we have $f^{-n}(y) \in U_K$. Let $n_0 = n_1 + n_2$.

5.2 The choices of points and perturbation domains in K and to get h.

Take any integer T_K. By Lemma 5.1, we have that $z_1 \prec_{U_K} K$, that is to say, there is a point $z_2 \in K$ such that $z_1 \prec_{U_K} z_2$. Now we consider two cases, depending on whether there is such a point z_2 that is not a periodic point with period less than or equal to N.

5.2.1 The non-periodic case

Assume that there is a point $z_2 \in K$ which is not a periodic point with period less than or equal to N, such that $z_1 \prec_{U_K} z_2$. Then there are two neighborhoods $V_{z_2} \subset U_{z_2}$ of z_2 satisfying the conclusion of the connecting lemma for the triple $(f, \mathcal{U}, N)$ and also satisfying the following conditions:

– $U_{z_2} \cup f(U_{z_2}) \cup \cdots \cup f^N(U_{z_2}) \subset U_K$;

– $(U_{z_1} \cup f(U_{z_1}) \cup \cdots \cup f^N(U_{z_1})) \cap (U_{z_2} \cup f(U_{z_2}) \cup \cdots \cup f^N(U_{z_2})) = \emptyset$;

– $f^{-n}(y) \notin U_{z_2} \cup f(U_{z_2}) \cup \cdots \cup f^N(U_{z_2})$, for any $n \leq n_2 + T_K$.

Then there is $n_3 > n_2 + T_K$, such that $f^{-n_3}(y) \in V_{z_2}$. Since we have the fact that $z_1 \prec_{U_K} z_2$, there is a piece of orbit $(w, f(w), \cdots, f^k(w))$ contained in U_K, such that $w \in V_{z_1}$ and $f^k(w) \in V_{z_2}$, and by the choice of U_{z_1}, we have that $w \notin orb(y)$.

Perturbations to get h in the non-periodic case. Now we do the perturbations step by step to get the conclusion.

Step 1. From the choice of points and neighborhoods above, we can see that the point x has a positive iterate $f^{n_1}(x) \in V_{z_1}$ and the point $f^k(w)$ has a negative iterate $w \in V_{z_1}$. Then by the connecting lemma, there is a diffeomorphism $f_1 \in \mathcal{U}$, such that f_1 coincides with f outside $U_{z_1} \cup f(U_{z_1}) \cup \cdots \cup f^N(U_{z_1})$ and $f^k(w)$ is on the positive orbit of x under f_1.

Step 2. For the diffeomorphism f_1, the point x has a positive iterate $f^k(w) \in V_{z_2}$, and the point y has a negative iterate $f^{-n_3}(y) \in V_{z_2}$. Since f_1 coincides with f outside

$U_{z_1}\cup f(U_{z_1})\cup\cdots\cup f^N(U_{z_1})$ and $(U_{z_1}\cup f(U_{z_1})\cup\cdots\cup f^N(U_{z_1}))\cap(U_{z_2}\cup f(U_{z_2})\cup\cdots\cup f^N(U_{z_2}))=\emptyset$, then by the connecting lemma, there is a diffeomorphism $h\in\mathcal{U}$, such that y is on the positive orbit of x under h and h coincides with f_1 outside $U_{z_2}\cup f(U_{z_2})\cup\cdots\cup f^N(U_{z_2})$.

By the constructions above, h coincides with f outside $(U_{z_1}\cup f(U_{z_1})\cup\cdots\cup f^N(U_{z_1}))\cup(U_{z_2}\cup f(U_{z_2})\cup\cdots\cup f^N(U_{z_2}))$. Hence h coincides with f on $orb(p)\cup orb^-(x)\cup orb^+(y)$ and outside U_K. Moreover, $\sharp(orb(x,h)\cap U_K)\geq n_3-n_2\geq T_K$ and $\sharp(orb(x,h)\setminus(U_K\cup U_p))\leq n_1+n_2\leq n_0$.

5.2.2 The periodic case

Assume that any point $z_2\in K$ satisfying $z_1\prec_{U_K}z_2$ is a periodic point with period less than or equal to N. We take such a point $q\in K$. In this case, we can not use the connecting lemma at the point q since its period is small but we can do perturbations at the stable and unstable manifolds of q since it is hyperbolic. To simplify the proof, we assume that q is a hyperbolic fixed point of f, but the general case is identical. We take a neighborhood U_q of q such that $\overline{U_q}\subset U_K\setminus(U_{z_1}\cup f(U_{z_1})\cup\cdots\cup f^N(U_{z_1}))$, and such that for any point w satisfying $orb^+(w)\subset U_q$ (rep. $orb^-(w)\subset U_q$), we have $w\in W^s(q)$ (resp. $w\in W^u(q)$).

Since $z_1\prec_{U_K}q$, similarly to the argument of Lemma 5.1, we can get that, there is a point $x'\in U_q$, such that $z_1\prec_{U_K}x'$ and $orb^+(x)\subset U_q$. By the choice of U_q, we have that $x'\in W^s(q)$ and $x'\notin U_{z_1}\cup f(U_{z_1})\cup\cdots\cup f^N(U_{z_1})$. Then x' is not a periodic point, thus $x'\notin K=\alpha(y)$. Then we can take two neighborhoods $V_{x'}\subset U_{x'}$ of x' that satisfy the conclusions of the connecting lemma for the triple $(f,\mathcal{U},N)$, and also satisfy that

– $U_{x'}\cup f(U_{x'})\cup\cdots,\cup f^N(U_{x'})\subset U_q$;

– $U_{x'}\cap orb(y)=\emptyset$ and $q\notin U_{x'}$.

Then, there is a piece of orbit $(w',\cdots,f^{k'}(w'))$ contained in U_K, such that $w'\in V_{z_1}$ and $f^{k'}(w')\in V_{x'}$. Moreover, $w'\notin orb(y)$.

Since $q\in\alpha(y)$, there is $y'\in W^u(q)\cap U_q$, such that for any neighborhood U of y', there is an integer $n\geq 1$, such that $f^{-n}(y)\in U$. (In fact, if $\alpha(y)=\{q\}$, we can choose y' to be a negative iterate of y. If $\{q\}\subsetneqq\alpha(y)$, we can choose y' to be contained in $\alpha(y)\cap W^u(q)$). Now, we build the perturbation domain at the point y' by Lemma 2.24. More precisely, we do as the following. We take a number $r'<r_0$ small enough, such that: if we take the neighborhood $U_{y'}=f(B(f^{-1}(y'),\theta r'))$ of y', then the following properties are satisfied:

– $U_{y'}\cup f^{-1}(U_{y'})\subset U_q\setminus(\{q\}\cup U_{x'}\cup f(U_{x'})\cup\cdots,\cup f^N(U_{x'}))$;

– $U_{y'}\cap f^{-1}(U_{y'})=\emptyset$;

– $\{w',\cdots,f^{k'}(w')\}\cap(U_{y'}\cup f^{-1}(U_{y'}))=\emptyset$.

Then by the λ-lemma, there is a piece of orbit $(z',f(z'),\cdots,f^{n_4}(z'))$ contained in U_q, such that $z'\in V_{x'}$, $f^{n_4}(z')\in B(f^{-1}(y'),r')$, $f^i(z')\notin U_{x'}$ for any $i\in\{1,2,\cdots,n_4\}$ and $n_4\geq T_K$. By the choice of y', there is a negative iterate $f^{-n_5}(y)$ of y contained in $B(f^{-1}(y'),r')$.

Perturbations to get h in the periodic case. From the above constructions, we can see that the perturbation domains are pairwise disjoint and contained in U_K, and the pieces of orbits that connects two perturbation domains are pairwise disjoint and disjoint from the other perturbation domains. Then we can do the perturbations step by step as in *Case 1.*

Step 1. By the basic perturbation lemma, there is $f_1\in\mathcal{U}$, such that, f_1 coincides with f outside $f^{-1}(U_{y'})$ and $f_1(f^{n_4}(z')=f^{-n_5+1}(y)$.

Step 2. For the diffeomorphism f_1, the point y has a negative iterate $z'\in V_{x'}$, and the point w' has a positive iterate $f^{k'}(w')\in V_{x'}$. Then by the connecting lemma, there is

$f_2 \in \mathcal{U}$, such that f_2 coincides with f_1 outside $U_{x'} \cup f(U_{x'}) \cup \cdots \cup f^N(U_{x'})$, and w' is on the negative orbit of y under f_2.

Step 3. For the diffeomorphism f_2, the point y has a negative iterate w' in V_{z_1} and the point x has a positive iterate $f^{n_1}(x) \in V_{z_1}$. By the connecting lemma, there is $h \in \mathcal{U}$, such that, h coincides with f_2 outside $U_{z_1} \cup f(U_{z_1}) \cup \cdots \cup f^N(U_{z_1})$ and y on the positive orbit of x under h.

By the constructions above, the diffeomorphism h coincides with f outside $(U_{z_1} \cup f(U_{z_1}) \cup \cdots \cup f^N(U_{z_1})) \cup (U_{x'} \cup f(U_{x'}) \cup \cdots \cup f^N(U_{x'})) \cup f^{-1}(U_{y'})$. Hence h coincides with f on $orb(p) \cup orb^-(x) \cup orb^+(y)$ and outside U_K. Moreover, $\sharp(orb(x,h) \cap U_K) \geq n_4 \geq T_K$ and $\sharp(orb(x,h) \setminus (U_K \cup U_p)) \leq n_1 + n_2 \leq n_0$.

5.3 The choice of l and the perturbation domains at x and y, and to get h_m.

From the constructions in section 5.2, we get the diffeomorphism h that satisfies the first item of Proposition 1. In this section, we do the perturbations to get the diffeomorphism h_m.

Assume $h^t(x) = y$. By replacing x and y to a negative or positive iteration, we assume that $x, y \in U_p$ and $orb^-(x,h) \cup orb^+(y,h) \subset U_p$. Assume that $\{h^n(x)\}_{1 \leq n \leq t} \cap U_p = m_0$. We take a number $r < r_0$ small enough, such that, if we take the neighborhood $U_x = h(B(h^{-1}(x), \theta r))$ of x and the neighborhood $U_y = B(y, \theta r)$ of y, then, the four sets U_x, $h^{-1}(U_x)$, U_y and $h(U_y)$ are contained in U_p and pairwise disjoint from each other and disjoint with $\{h^n(x)\}_{1 \leq n \leq t}$. By the λ-Lemma, there is $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that, for any $m \geq 1$, there is a piece of orbit $(h(z), h^2(z), \cdots, h^{l_0+m-1}(z))$ contained in U_p, such that $h(z) \in B(y,r)$, $h^{l_0+m-1}(z) \in B(h^{-1}(x), r)$ and $h^i(z) \notin U_y \cup h^{-1}(U_x)$ for any $i = 2, 3, \cdots, l_0 + m - 2$. Let $l = l_0 + m_0$.

By the basic perturbation lemma and the disjointness of U_y, $f^{-1}(U_x)$ and U_K, there is $h_m \in \mathcal{U}$, such that, h_m coincides with h outside $U_y \cup f^{-1}(U_x)$, and $h_m(y) = h^2(z)$, $h_m(f^{l_0+m-1}(z)) = h_m^{l_0+m-1}(y) = x$. Hence h_m coincides with h on $orb(p)$ and outside U_p. Moreover, the point x is a periodic point of h_m, and denote $O = orb(x, h_m)$, we have that $O \setminus U_p = (orb(x,h) \setminus U_p$, and $\sharp(O \cap U_p) = l_0 + m_0 + m = l + m$.

This finishes the proof of Proposition 1.

Remark 5.2. *We point out here that, in the non-periodic case, we can not do the same perturbations at x' and y' just as at the points x and y. Because the piece of orbit $(w', \cdots, f^{k'}(w'))$ that connects the neighborhoods V_{z_1} and $V_{x'}$ of z_1 and x' respectively may enter into the neighborhood $U_{x'}$ many times before $f^{k'}(w')$. Thus if we use the basic perturbation lemma to connect $f^{k'}(w')$ to $f(z')$, the piece of orbit $(w', \cdots, f^{k'}(w'))$ may be modified and it is not clear if the negative orbit of y can intersect V_{z_1} after such perturbation. Thus we can not get a periodic orbit.*

6 Asymptotic approximation for true orbits: proof of Proposition 2

In this section, we give a proof of Proposition 2. In fact, the proof is almost the same as the proof of Proposition 10 in [17]. We only have to explain why the perturbations will not modify $orb^-(x)$. We assume that for any point $y \in W^u(p,f)$, we have $\omega(y) \setminus K \neq \emptyset$, otherwise there is nothing needed to prove. Also we assume that $x \notin K$. Otherwise, the proof follows exactly that of Proposition 10 in [17]. We take two steps to get our purpose:

- we choose a sequence of non-periodic points $(z_n)_{n\geq 0}$, such that:
$$z_0 \prec z_1 \prec \cdots \prec K,\ z_0 \in \overline{W^u(p)} \text{ and } z_n \notin \overline{orb^-(x)}, \text{ for any } n \geq 0,$$
- then we perturb at every z_n to connect all the points together and avoid $orb^-(x)$.

In order to prove Proposition 2, we take a decreasing sequence of C^1-neighborhoods $(\mathcal{U}_n)$ of f that satisfies the following properties:

- $\overline{\mathcal{U}_0} \subset \mathcal{U}$,
- the element of $\mathcal{U}_n$ is of the form $f \circ \phi$ with $\phi \in \mathcal{V}_n$, where $(\mathcal{V}_n)$ is a decreasing sequence of C^1 neighborhoods of Id that satisfy the property (F) stated in Section 5, and $\cap_n \mathcal{V}_n = \{Id\}$.

Then we have that $\cap_n \mathcal{U}_n = \{f\}$. The connecting lemma associates to each pair $(f, \mathcal{U}_k)$ a number N_k.

We need the following three lemmas for the proof of Proposition 2.

Lemma 6.1. *For any neighborhood W of K, there is a point $z \in (W \cap \overline{W^u(p)}) \setminus K$, such that, $z \prec_W K$ and $orb^+(z) \subset W$. Moreover, $z \notin orb^-(x)$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 5.1. We assume W is a small neighborhood of K such that $x \notin \overline{W}$ and $p \notin W$. Take an open neighborhood $V \subset W$ of K, such that $\overline{V} \subset W$. Since $\overline{W^u(p)} \cap K \neq \emptyset$, then for any $k \geq 1$, there is a point $x_k \in W^u(p)$ and a positive integer $n(k)$, such that $f^{n(k)}(x_k) \in B(K, \frac{1}{k})$. For k large, the set $B(K, \frac{1}{k})$ is contained in V. We consider the smallest integer m_k such that the piece of orbit $(f^{m(k)}(x_k), \cdots, f^{n(k)}(x_k))$ is contained in V. By the assumption that $\omega(x_k) \setminus K \neq \emptyset$ for any $k \geq 1$, we can see that both $m(K)$ and $n(k) - m(k)$ go to infinity as k goes to infinity.

Take converging subsequences if necessary, assume the sequence $\{f^{m(k)}(x_k)\}$ converges to a point $z \in \overline{V}$, and $\{f^{n(k)}(x_k)\}$ converges to a point $z' \in K$. Then $z \in \overline{W^u(p)}$, and similar to the argument of Lemma 5.1, we have that $z \notin K$, and $z \prec_W z'$, hence $z \prec_W K$. Since $f^{m(k)}(x_k), \cdots, f^{n(k)}(x_k)$ is contained in V and $n(k) - m(k)$ go to infinity, we have that $orb^+(z) \subset W$. Then by the assumption $x \notin \overline{W}$, we have $z \notin orb^-(x)$. ☐

Lemma 6.2. *There are a point $y \in W^u(p)$, a sequence of points $(z_k)_{k\geq 1}$, three sequences of neighborhoods $(U_k)_{k\geq 1}$, $(V_k)_{k\geq 1}$, $(W_k)_{k\geq 0}$ and a sequence of finite segment of orbits $Y_k = (y_k, f(y_k), \cdots, f^{m(k)}(y_k))_{k\geq 0}$, such that:*

1. *$W_k \subset W_{k+1}$ and $\cap_k W_k = K$;*
2. *the connecting lemma can be applied to $z_k \in V_k \subset U_k$ for the triple $(f, \mathcal{U}_k, N_k)$, and $\overline{f^n(U_k)} \subset W_k \setminus W_{k+1}$ for all $0 \leq n \leq N_k$;*
3. *$\overline{U_k} \cap orb^-(x) = \emptyset$, for any $k \geq 1$;*
4. *$z_1 \prec_{W_1} z_2 \prec_{W_2} \cdots \prec_{W_k} z_{k+1} \prec \cdots \prec K$;*
5. *the points $f^{m(k)}(y_k)$ and y_{k+1} are contained in V_{k+1} for all $k \geq 0$ where $y_0 = y$, and $orb^-(y) \cap W_1 = \emptyset$;*
6. *$Y_k \subset W_k \setminus W_{k+2}$ for all $k \geq 0$ and $Y_k \cap orb^-(x) = \emptyset$, for all $k \geq 0$;*
7. *there is an open set V containing $orb^-(x)$, such that $V \cap U_k = \emptyset$ for all $k \geq 1$.*

Proof. We build all the sequences by induction. Set $W_0 = M$. We first choose W_1, z_1, V_1, U_1 and Y_0.

Since all periodic orbits in K are hyperbolic, there is a neighborhood W_1 of K, such that there is no periodic points with period less than or equal to N_1 contained in $W_1 \setminus K$. Also we can assume that $p \notin \overline{W_1}$. By Lemma 6.1, there is $z_1 \in W_1 \setminus K$, such that $z_1 \prec_{W_1} K$, $z_1 \notin orb^-(x)$, and $z_1 \in \overline{W^u(p)}$. By the choice of W_1, there is a neighborhood U_1 of z_1, that is disjoint from its N_1 first iterates. Moreover, because $z_1 \notin \overline{orb^-(x)}$, we can assume $\overline{U_1} \cap (orb^-(x) \cup K) = \emptyset$. By the connecting lemma, there is $V_1 \subset U_1$ associated to $(f, \mathcal{U}_1, N_1)$. Then there are a point $y \in W^u(p) \setminus W_1$ and a positive integer $m(0)$, such that $f^{m(0)}(y) \in V_1$. Moreover, by considering a negative iterate of y if necessary, we can assume that $orb^-(y) \cap W_1 = \emptyset$. We take $y_0 = y$ and $Y_0 = (y, f(y), \cdots, f^{m(0)}(y))$.

Now we construct the sequences by induction on k. After W_k, z_k, V_k, U_k and Y_{k-1} have been built, there is $W_{k+1} \subset W_k$ such that

- there is no periodic point with period less than or equal to N_{k+1} contained in $\overline{W_{k+1}} \setminus K$;
- $\overline{f^n(U_k)} \cap W_{k+1} = \emptyset$, for all $1 \le n \le N_k$;
- $W_{k+1} \cap Y_{k-1} = \emptyset$;
- W_{k+1} is contained in $B(K, \frac{1}{k})$.

By Lemma 2.13, there is $z_{k+1} \in W_{k+1} \setminus K$, such that $z_k \prec_{W_k} z_{k+1} \prec_{W_{k+1}} K$, $z_{k+1} \notin \overline{orb^-(x)}$ and $orb^+(z_{k+1}) \subset W_{k+1}$. By the connecting lemma, there are neighborhoods $V_{k+1} \subset U_{k+1}$ of z_{k+1} associated to $(f, \mathcal{U}_{k+1}, N_{k+1})$, such that:

- $\overline{U_{k+1}} \cap (orb^-(x) \cup K) = \emptyset$,
- $\overline{f^n(U_{k+1})} \subset W_{k+1}$ for all $0 \le n \le N_{k+1}$.

Then there is $Y_k = (y_k, f(y_k), \cdots, f^{m(k)}(y_k))$, such that $y_k \in V_k$ and $f^{m(k)}(y_k) \in V_{k+1}$. Since $\overline{U_{k+1}} \cap orb^-(x) = \emptyset$, Y_k is disjoint from $orb^-(x)$.

Since $x \notin K$, for any integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is n_k, such that $f^{-n}(x) \notin W_{n_k}$. By item 2 and 3, there is an open neighborhood B_n of $f^{-n}(x)$, such that $B_n \cap U_k = \emptyset$ for any $k \ge 1$. We take $V = \bigcup_{n \ge 0} B_n$, then item 7 is satisfied. Then we finish the proof of Lemma 6.2. ☐

Now we fix the point $y \in W^u(p)$, the open set V and the sequences $(z_k)_{k\ge1}$, $(U_k)_{k\ge1}$, $(V_k)_{k\ge1}$, $(W_k)_{k\ge0}$ and $(Y_k)_{k\ge0}$ as in Lemma 6.2. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 6.3. *There are a sequence of perturbations $(g_k)_{k\ge0}$ of f and a strictly increasing sequence of integers $(n_k)_{k\ge0}$, such that,*

1. *$g_0 = f$ and $n_0 = 0$;*
2. *there is $\phi_k \in \mathcal{V}_k$, such that $\phi_k = Id|_{M\setminus(U_k \cup \cdots \cup f^{N_k - 1}(U_k))}$ and $g_k = g_{k-1} \circ \phi_k$, for $k \ge 1$;*
3. *for any $l = \{0, 1, \cdots, k-1\}$, the piece of orbit $(g_k^{n_l}(y), g_k^{n_l+1}(y), \cdots, g_k^{n_{l+1}}(y))$ is contained in $W_l \setminus W_{l+2}$.*

Proof. We build inductively the sequences (g_k) and (n_k) and another sequence of integers $(m_k)_{k\ge0}$ to satisfy the conclusions and also the following properties:

- $m_k > n_k$ and $g_k^{m_k}(y) \in V_{k+1}$;
- the piece of orbit $(g_k^{n_k}(y), g_k^{n_k+1}(y), \cdots, g_k^{m_k}(y))$ is contained in $W_k \setminus W_{k+2}$.

First, we take $g_0 = f$ and $n_0 = 0$. By Lemma 6.2, there is $m_0 > 0$, such that $g_0^{m_0}(y) \in V_1$ and the piece of orbit $(y = g_0^{n_0}(y), g_0(y), \cdots, g_0^{m_0}(y))$ is contained in $W_0 \setminus W_2$.

Now assume that g_k, n_k and m_k have been built, we explain how to get g_{k+1}, n_{k+1} and m_{k+1}. The point $g_k^{n_k}(y)$ has a positive iterate $g_k^{m_k}(y) \in V_{k+1}$, and the point $f^{m(k+1)}(y_{k+1})$

has a negative iterate $y_{k+1} \in V_{k+1}$. Since g_k coincides with f on the set $U_{k+1} \cup f(U_{k+1}) \cup \cdots \cup f^{N_{k+1}}(U_{k+1})$, one can apply the connecting lemma to $(g_k, \mathcal{U}_{k+1}, V_{k+1}, U_{k+1})$ and get a diffeomorphism g_{k+1}, such that, the point $f^{m(k+1)}(y_{k+1})$ is on the positive orbit of $g_k^{n_k}(y)$ under iteration of g_{k+1}, and, moreover, the new diffeomorphism g_{k+1} is of the form $g_k \circ \phi_{k+1}$, where $\phi_{k+1} = Id|_{M \setminus (U_{k+1} \cup \cdots \cup f^{N_{k+1}-1}(U_{k+1}))}$ and $f \circ \phi_{k+1} \in \mathcal{U}_{k+1}$, thus $\phi_{k+1} \in \mathcal{V}_{k+1}$.

Since $g_{k+1} = g_k|_{M \setminus (U_{k+1} \cup \cdots \cup f^{N_{k+1}-1}(U_{k+1}))}$, the piece of orbit $y, g_k(y), \cdots, g_k^{n_k}(y)$ under g_k coincides with the one $y, g_{k+1}(y), \cdots, g_{k+1}^{n_k}(y)$. Moreover, the point $g_k^{n_k}(y)$ has a positive iterate $f^{m(k+1)}(y_{k+1})$ under g_{k+1} contained in V_{k+2}. Assume $f^{m(k+1)}(y_{k+1}) = g_{k+1}^{m_{k+1}}(y)$, then there is an integer n_{k+1} with $n_k < n_{k+1} < m_{k+1}$, such that, the piece of orbit $(g_{k+1}^{n_k}(y), \cdots, g_{k+1}^{n_{k+1}}(y))$ is contained in $W_k \setminus W_{k+2}$ and the piece of orbit $(g_{k+1}^{n_{k+1}}(y), \cdots, g_{k+1}^{m_{k+1}}(y))$ is contained in $W_{k+1} \setminus W_{k+3}$. Then the conclusions are satisfied for $k+1$. $\square$

End of the proof of Proposition 2. Since the supports $U_i \cup \cdots \cup f^{N_i-1}(U_i)$ and $U_j \cup \cdots \cup f^{N_j-1}(U_j)$ of the perturbations ϕ_i and ϕ_j are disjoint for any $i \neq j$, and $(\mathcal{V}_n)$ satisfy the property F, then the sequence $g_k = f \circ \phi_1 \circ \cdots \circ \phi_k$ converges to a diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}_0 \subset \mathcal{U}$. By the constructions, g coincides with $f \circ \phi_k$ in the set $U_k \cup \cdots \cup f^{N_k-1}(U_k)$ and with f elsewhere, hence, by the choice of (U_k) and V, it holds that g coincides with f on the set $orb(p) \cup K \cup V \cup orb^-(y)$ and $\omega(y, g) \subset K$. Moreover, since g is the limit of the sequence (g_k), by Lemma 6.3, for any $n > n_k$, $g^n(y) \in W_k$. Then we have that $\omega(y, g) \subset K$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 2. $\square$

7 Asymptotic approximation for pseudo-orbits: proof of Proposition 3

To prove Proposition 3, we use the technics of [8, 17] to get true orbits by perturbing a pseudo-orbit. Similarly to the proof of Proposition 2, we have to perturb infinitely many times in a special neighborhood to keep some part of the initial dynamic unchanged. The proof refers a lot to [8] and Section 3.2 of [19].

We take several steps for the proof. First, we choose an open set that covers all positive orbits of X that are not on the local stable manifold of periodic orbits with small periods. Actually, we choose a special topological tower for X. Second, we construct a sequence of disjoint perturbation domains containing in their interior the special topological tower for X. Then, we choose an infinitely long pseudo-orbit in X that goes from z to K and has jumps only in the perturbation domains and accumulates to K in the future. Finally, we perturb in the perturbation domains to construct a true orbit which goes from z to K and accumulates to K in the future.

We take a C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_0$ of the diffeomorphism f_0 with $\overline{\mathcal{U}_0} \subset \mathcal{U}$, such that, the element of $\mathcal{U}_0$ is of the form $f \circ \phi$ with $\phi \in \mathcal{V}_0$, where $\mathcal{V}_0$ is a C^1-neighborhood of Id that satisfies the property (F) stated in Section 5. Then there is a smaller C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{U}' \subset \mathcal{U}_0$ of f_0 and an integer N_0 associated to $(f_0, \mathcal{U}_0)$ by the uniform connecting lemma (Theorem 2.23). Take the integer $T = 10\kappa_d d N_0$ where the number κ_d is the number given by Lemma 2.32.

From now on, we fix the C^1 neighborhoods $\mathcal{U}' \subset \mathcal{U}_0$ of f_0 and the integer T. We consider a diffeomorphism $f \in \mathcal{U}'$, an invariant compact set K containing no non-hyperbolic periodic point, a positive invariant compact set X containing no non-hyperbolic periodic point with period less than or equal to T, a point z that can be connected to K by pseudo-orbits in X, and a neighborhood U of $X\setminus K$. Then we consider a decreasing sequence of C^1-neighborhoods $(\mathcal{U}_n)_{n\geq 0}$ of f, such that, the element of $\mathcal{U}_n$ is of the form $f\circ\phi$ with $\phi\in\mathcal{V}_n$, where $(\mathcal{V}_n)$ is a decreasing sequence of C^1 neighborhoods of Id that satisfy the property (F), and $\cap_n\mathcal{V}_n=\{Id\}$. The connecting lemma associates to each pair $(f,\mathcal{U}_k)$ an integer N_k and we can assume that (N_k) is an increasing sequence. Here the neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_0$ and the integer N_0 are exactly what we have chosen in the above paragraph. We assume that $z\notin K$, otherwise, there is noting to prove. For an integer N, denote by $Per_N(f)$ the set of periodic points of f whose period is no more than N.

7.1 Choice of topological towers

In this section, we construct a family of special topological towers for the set X with the properties stated in Lemma 7.1.

Lemma 7.1. *For any increasing sequence of integers $(L_k)_{k\geq 0}$ where $L_0=10dN_0$, for any $\delta>0$, there are a decreasing sequence of neighborhoods $(U_k)_{k\geq 0}$ of K, a sequence of open sets $(W_k)_{k\geq 0}$, and a sequence of compact sets $(D_k)_{k\geq 0}$, such that, denoting $X_k=X\cap\overline{(U_k\setminus U_{k+1})}$ for all $k\geq 0$, the following properties are satisfied.*

- *The intersection $\bigcap_{k\geq 0}U_k=K$, where $U_0=M$ and $z\notin\overline{U_1}$,*
- *If we take $U_{-1}=M$, then for any $k\geq 0$,*
  1. *there is no periodic orbit with period less than $\kappa_d L_{k+1}$ contained in $\overline{U_{k+1}}\setminus K$,*
  2. *$f^i(\overline{U_{k+1}})\subset U_k$, for all $-4\kappa_d L_{k+1}\leq i\leq 4\kappa_d L_{k+1}$,*
  3. *the L_k sets $\overline{W_k}, f(\overline{W_k}),\cdots,f^{L_k-1}(\overline{W_k})$ are pairwise disjoint, contained in $U\setminus K$, and also contained in $U_{k-1}\setminus\overline{U_{k+2}}$,*
  4. *for any $-4\kappa_d L_{k+2}\leq i\leq 4\kappa_d L_{k+2}$, we have that $f^i(\overline{U_{k+2}})\cap\overline{(W_0\cup\cdots\cup W_k)}=\emptyset$,*
  5. *for any $l<k$, any $0\leq i\leq L_l$ and any $0\leq j\leq L_k$, we have that $\overline{f^i(W_l)}\cap\overline{f^j(W_k)}=\emptyset$,*
  6. *the compact set D_k is contained in W_k, such that, any point in $X_0\setminus(\bigcup_{p\in Per_{L_0}(f)}W^s_\delta(p))$ has a positive iterate in $int(D_0)$ and any point in X_k has a positive iterate in $int(D_{k-1}\cup D_k)$.*

Remark 7.2. *The set $W_0\cup\cdots\cup W_k$ can be seen as a special topological tower for $X_0\cup\cdots\cup X_k$, from the items 3, 5, and 6.*

Proof. We build inductively the sequences $(U_k)_{k\geq 0}$, $(W_k)_{k\geq 0}$ and $(D_k)_{k\geq 0}$ from a sequence of open sets $(W'_k)_{k\geq 0}$ and a sequence of compact sets $(D'_k)_{k\geq 0}$, which satisfy the following additional properties: for any $k\geq 0$,

- *1'. the set W_k is contained in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of W'_k, and $W'_k\subset W_k$,*
- *2'. the sets $\overline{W'_k}, f(\overline{W'_k}),\cdots,f^{L_k-1}(\overline{W'_k})$ are pairwise disjoint, contained in $U\setminus K$, and also contained in $U_{k-1}\setminus\overline{U_{k+2}}$,*
- *3'. for all $-4\kappa_d L_{k+2}\leq i\leq 4\kappa_d L_{k+2}$, we have $f^i(\overline{U_{k+2}}))\cap\overline{(W'_0\cup\cdots\cup W'_k)}=\emptyset$,*
- *4'. for any $l<k$, any $0\leq i\leq L_l$ and any $0\leq j\leq L_k$, we have $\overline{f^i(W_l)}\cap\overline{f^j(W'_k)}=\emptyset$,*
- *5'. any point in $X_0\setminus(\bigcup_{p\in Per_{L_0}(f)}W^s_\delta(p))$ has a positive iterate in $int(D'_0)$ and any point in X_k has a positive iterate contained in $int(D'_k)$ for any $k\geq 1$.*

We build the sets U_{k+3}, W'_{k+2}, D'_{k+2}, W_{k+1} and D_{k+1} after the sets U_{k+2}, W'_{k+1}, D'_{k+1}, W_k and D_k have been built.

The sets U_2, W_1', D_1', W_0 and D_0. By the assumption of hyperbolicity of periodic orbits in K, we can take a neighborhood $U_1 \subset B(K,1)$ of K such that $z \notin \overline{U_1}$ and there is no periodic orbit with periodic less than $\kappa_d L_1$ in $\overline{U_1} \setminus K$. The properties *1* and *2* are satisfied.

By Lemma 2.32, there are an open set $W_0' \subset U$ that is disjoint from its L_0 iterates and a compact set $D_0' \subset W_0'$ such that any point contained in $X_0 \setminus (\bigcup_{p \in Per_{L_0}(f)} W^s_\delta(p))$ has a positive iterate contained in $int(D_0')$. Moreover, by the item *3* of Lemma 2.32, the open set W_0' can be contained in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of $X_0 \cup f(X_0) \cup \cdots \cup f^{\kappa_d L_0}(X_0)$. Hence we can assume that and $\bigcup_{i=0}^{L_0} f^i(\overline{W_0'}) \subset U \setminus K$, since X is positively invariant. The property *5 ′* is satisfied.

Now we take a neighborhood $U_2 \subset U_1 \cap B(K, \frac{1}{2})$ of K, such that:

- there is no periodic orbit with periodic less than $\kappa_d L_2$ in $\overline{U_2} \setminus K$, which is the property *1*,
- $f^i(\overline{U_2}) \subset U_1$, for all $-4\kappa_d L_2 \leq i \leq 4\kappa_d L_2$, which is the property *2*,
- $\overline{W_0'} \cap f^i(\overline{U_2}) = \emptyset$ for all $-4\kappa_d L_2 \leq i \leq 4\kappa_d L_2$, which implies the properties *2 ′* and *3 ′*.

By Lemma 2.32, for the compact set $X_1 = X \cap \overline{U_1 \setminus U_2}$, there is an open set V_1' disjoint from its $\kappa_d L_1$ iterates, such that any point contained in X_1 has a positive iterate contained in V_1'. Moreover, V_1' can be contained in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\kappa_d L_1} f^i(X_1)$.

By Lemma 2.31, consider W_0' and V_1' as W' and V', we get an open set $S_1 = W_0 \cup V_1$, such that

- $\overline{S_1} \subset U \setminus K$,
- W_0 is a small neighborhood of W_0', disjoint from its L_0 iterates, hence the properties *2 ′* and *3 ′* imply the properties 3 and 4 if we choose W_k small enough, and the property *1 ′* is satisfied automatically,
- V_1 is contained in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of $V_1' \cup f(V_1') \cup \cdots \cup f^{\kappa_d L_1}(V_1')$ and disjoint from its L_1 iterates, thus we can assume that $K \cap \overline{V_1} = \emptyset$,
- $V_1' \subset \bigcup_{i=0}^{\kappa_d L_1} f^i(S_1)$,
- $\overline{W_0} \cap f^i(\overline{V_1}) = \emptyset$ for all $i = 0, \pm 1, \cdots, \pm L_1$.

Then any point contained in X_1 has a positive iterate contained in S_1. By the compactness of X_1, there is a compact set $D_1' \subset S_1$ such that all such iterates are contained in $int(D_1')$. Set $W_1' = V_1$ and $D_0 = D_0' \cup (D_1' \cap W_0)$. The properties *6*, *2 ′*, *3 ′*, *4 ′* and *5 ′* are satisfied.

Hence we have built the sets U_1, U_2, W_0', D_0', W_1', D_1', W_0 and D_0.

Construction of the sets U_{k+3}, W_{k+2}', D_{k+2}', W_{k+1} and D_{k+1}. For $k \geq 0$, assume the sets U_{k+2}, W_{k+1}', D_{k+1}', W_k and D_k have been built to satisfy the properties above for all $n \leq k$, we now explain how to get the sets U_{k+3}, W_{k+2}', D_{k+2}', W_{k+1} and D_{k+1}.

We can take a neighborhood $U_{k+3} \subset U_{k+2} \cap B(K, \frac{1}{k+3})$ of K, such that:

- there is no periodic orbit with periodic less than $\kappa_d L_{k+3}$ in $\overline{U_{k+3}} \setminus K$, which is the property *1*,
- $f^i(\overline{U_{k+3}}) \subset U_{k+2}$, for all $-4\kappa_d L_{k+2} \leq i \leq 4\kappa_d L_{k+3}$, which is the property *2*,
- $\overline{W_0 \cup \cdots W_k \cup W_{k+1}'} \cap f^i(\overline{U_{k+3}}) = \emptyset$ for all $-4\kappa_d L_{k+3} \leq i \leq 4\kappa_d L_{k+3}$, which implies the property *3 ′*.

By Lemma 2.32, for the set $X_{k+2} = X \cap \overline{U_{k+2} \setminus U_{k+3}}$, there is an open set V_{k+2}' disjoint from its $\kappa_d L_{k+2}$ iterates, such that any point contained in X_{k+2} has a positive iterate contained in V_{k+2}'. Moreover, V_{k+2}' can be contained in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\kappa_d L_{k+2}} f^i(X_{k+2})$. Since $X_{k+2} \subset \overline{U_{k+2}}$, and for all $-4\kappa_d L_{k+2} \leq i \leq 4\kappa_d L_{k+2}$,we have that $f^i(\overline{U_{k+2}})) \cap \overline{(W_0 \cup \cdots \cup W_k)} = \emptyset$ and $f^i(\overline{U_{k+2}})) \subset U_{k+1}$, then we can assume that $f^i(\overline{V'_{k+2}})) \cap (\overline{W_0 \cup \cdots \cup W_k} \cup K) = \emptyset$ and $f^i(\overline{V'_{k+2}})) \subset U_{k+1}$, for all $-2\kappa_d L_{k+2} \leq i \leq 2\kappa_d L_{k+2}$.

By Lemma 2.31, consider W'_{k+1} and V'_{k+2} as W' and V', we get an open set $S_{k+2} = W_{k+1} \cup V_{k+2}$, such that

- $\overline{S_{k+2}} \subset U \setminus K$,
- W_{k+1} is a small neighborhood of W'_{k+1}, disjoint from its L_{k+1} iterates, hence the properties *2 ′*, *3 ′* and *4 ′* imply the properties 3, 4 and 5 if we choose W_{k+1} small enough, and the property *1 ′* is satisfied automatically,
- V_{k+2} is contained in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of $V'_{k+2} \cup f(V'_{k+2}) \cup \cdots \cup f^{\kappa_d L_{k+2}}(V'_{k+2})$ and disjoint from its L_{k+2} iterates, thus we can assume that $K \cap \overline{V_{k+2}} = \emptyset$, and for all $-\kappa_d L_{k+2} \leq i \leq \kappa_d L_{k+2}$, we have $f^i(\overline{V_{k+2}})) \cap \overline{(W_0 \cup \cdots \cup W_k)} = \emptyset$ and $f^i(\overline{V_{k+2}})) \subset U_{k+1}$,
- $V'_{k+2} \subset \bigcup_{i=0}^{\kappa_d L_{k+2}} f^i(S_{k+2})$,
- $\overline{W_{k+1}} \cap f^i(\overline{V_{k+2}}) = \emptyset$ for all $i = 0, \pm 1, \cdots, \pm L_{k+2}$.

Then any point contained in X_{k+2} has a positive iterate contained in S_{k+2}. By the compactness of X_{k+2}, there is a compact set $D'_{k+2} \subset S_{k+2}$ such that all such iterates are contained in $int(D'_{k+2})$. Set $W'_{k+2} = V_{k+2}$ and $D_{k+1} = D'_{k+1} \cup (D'_{k+2} \cap W_{k+1})$. The properties *6*, *2 ′*, *3 ′*, *4 ′* and *5 ′* are satisfied.

Then we have built the sets U_{k+3}, W'_{k+2}, D'_{k+2}, W_{k+1} and D_{k+1}. The first property that $\bigcap_{k \geq 0} U_k = K$ and $z \notin \overline{U_1}$ are obviously satisfied by the choice of U_k. This finishes the proof of Lemma 7.1. □

7.2 Construction of perturbation domains

Now we take $L_k = 10dN_k$ for all $k \geq 0$, and take a small number $\delta > 0$, such that for any two different hyperbolic periodic points $q_1, q_2 \in Per_{N_0}(f) \cap X$, we have $W^{\sigma_1}_\delta(q_1) \cap W^{\sigma_2}_\delta(q_2) = \emptyset$, where $\sigma_i \in \{u, s\}$. By Lemma 7.1, we get the sequences $(U_k)_{k\geq 0}$, $(W_k)_{k \geq 0}$ and $(D_k)_{k \geq 0}$. We still denote $X_k = X \cap \overline{(U_{k-1} \setminus U_k)}$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Now we build the perturbation domains for the family (X_k). The technics are mainly from Section 4.1 and 4.2 of [8]. First, we build the perturbation domains that covers the points which are not on the local stable manifolds of periodic orbits with period less than or equal to N_0. The proof is essentially due to Corollaire 4.1 of [8]. They deal with a family of perturbation domains with the same order, thus the union forms a perturbation domain. Here we have a sequence of perturbation domains with different orders. The construction of each perturbation domain can be separated.

Lemma 7.3. *There is a perturbation domain B_k of order N_k for $(f, \mathcal{U}_k)$ for each $k \geq 0$, such that the sequence $(B_k)_{k \geq 0}$ satisfies the following properties.*

1. *The support of the perturbations domains B_k are pairwise disjoint, contained in U, and also contained in $U_{k-1} \setminus \overline{U_{k+2}}$.*
2. *Any point of $X_0 \setminus (\bigcup_{p \in Per_{N_0}(f)} W^s_\delta(p))$ has a positive iterate in the interior of one tile of one perturbation domain of B_0 and any point of X_k has a positive iterate in the interior of one tile of one perturbation domain of $B_{k-1} \cup B_k$.*

In consequence, for any $k \geq 0$, there is a finite family of tiles $\mathcal{C}_k$ associated to B_k, and a family of compact sets $\mathcal{D}_k$ contained in the interior of tiles of $\mathcal{C}_k$, such that:

- *each tile of $\mathcal{C}_k$ contains exactly one element of $\mathcal{D}_k$, for all $k \geq 0$ and each element of $\mathcal{D}_k$ is contained in a tile of $\mathcal{C}_k$,*
- *any point of $X_0 \setminus (\bigcup_{p \in Per_{N_0}(f)} W^s_\delta(p))$ has a positive iterate in the interior of one element of $\mathcal{D}_0$ and any point of X_k has a positive iterate in the interior of one element of $\mathcal{D}_{k-1} \cup \mathcal{D}_k$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.1, we get a sequence of open sets $(W_k)_{k \geq 0}$ and a sequence of compact sets $(D_k)_{k \geq 0}$. Moreover, the diameters of components of each W_k can be chosen small enough such that all their first L_k iterates are contained in a perturbation domain of order L_k by Lemma 2.29.

Assume W is a component of W_k, and denote $D = D_k \cap W$. By assumption, W is contained in a chart of perturbation $\varphi : W \to \mathbb{R}^d$. We can tile W with tiles of proper size such that any cube that intersects $\varphi(D)$ is contained in $\varphi(W)$. We do the same thing for all other components of W_k that has non-empty intersection with D_k and we get a finite family $\mathcal{P}_0$ of perturbation domains, each of them being an open set, pairwise disjoint, contained in W_k, and the union of their closure contains D_k in its interior. Denote Φ_0 the family of perturbation charts in the construction of $\mathcal{P}_0$.

Repeat the construction for $f^{2iN_k}(W_k)$ and $f^{2iN_k}(D_k)$, $i \in \{1, \cdots, 5d-1\}$, and we get the families $\mathcal{P}_i$ of perturbation domains contained in $f^{2iN_k}(W_k)$, pairwise disjoint and the union of their closure contains $f^{2iN_k}(D_k)$ in its interior. Denote Φ_i the family of perturbation charts corresponding to $\mathcal{P}_i$. Consider the family $f^{-2iN_k}(\mathcal{P}_i)$ contained in W_k. The union of the closure of all cubes of $f^{-2iN_k}(\mathcal{P}_i)$ contains D_k in its interior. By a C^1 small perturbation of Φ_i, we can suppose that a point in D_k can only be contained on the boundary of at most d different cubes of all cubes contained in $\cup_{i=0}^{5d-1} f^{-2iN_k}(\mathcal{P}_i)$ [1]. Since there are at least $5d$ families of cubes, we get that any point of D_k is contained in the interior of at least $4d$ families of such cubes.

We replace every cube in $\mathbb{R}^d$ by another one with the same center and homothetic with rate $\rho < 1$ close to 1. Then we get the families $\mathcal{P}_{i,\rho}$ of perturbation domains whose closures are pairwise disjoint. If we choose ρ close enough to 1, then any point of D_k is still contained in the interior of a cube of at least $4d$ families of $(f^{-2dN_k}(\mathcal{P}_{i,\rho}))_{0 \leq k \leq 5d-1}$. By the compactness of D_k, for each i, there is a finite family Γ_i of tiles of the domains $f^{-2iN_k}(\mathcal{P}_{i,\rho})$, such that the union Σ_i of the tiles of Γ_i satisfies: any point of D_k is contained in the interior of at least $4d$ compact $(f^{-2iN_k}(\Sigma_i))_{0 \leq k \leq 5d-1}$.

By another C^1 small perturbation of Φ_i, we can suppose that any point of D_k is contained on the boundary of the tiles of at most d families of $(f^{-2iN_k}(\Gamma_i))_{0 \leq k \leq 5d-1}$. Any point is contained in at least $4d$ families of tiles, hence any point is contained in the interior of at least one of these tiles. Define B_k and $\mathcal{C}_k$ to be the union of the families $\mathcal{P}_{i,\rho}$ and the union of the families Γ_i respectively.

Then the compact set D_k is covered by the interior of the tiles of the family $f^{-2iN_k}(\Gamma_i)$. We can take all the components of the intersection of $f^{2iN_k}(D_k)$ and the elements of the family Γ_i, and this is the family $\mathcal{D}_k$.

Finally, by the assumption that $L_k = 10dN_k$ and the choice of W_k in Lemma 7.1, the supports of perturbation domains $(B_k)_{k \geq 0}$ are pairwise disjoint and are contained in U. Moreover, the support of the perturbation domain B_k is also contained in $U_{k-1} \setminus \overline{U_{k+2}}$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 7.3. ☐

---

[1] In [8], they call the sets of $\cup_{i=0}^{5d-1} f^{-2iN_k}(\mathcal{P}_i)$ on general position. To simplify, we do not introduce this definition. One can refer to Section 3.3 of [8] for more details

We also have to construct perturbation domains that cover the stable and unstable manifolds of periodic orbits contained in $X_0 \cap Per_{N_0}(f)$. By the assumption of hyperbolicity of periodic orbits, $X_0 \cap Per_{N_0}(f)$ is a finite set. By Proposition 4.2 in [8], we can construct in the following way.

Lemma 7.4. (Proposition 4.2 of [8]) *For any periodic orbit $Q \subset X \cap Per_{N_0}(f)$, any neighborhood V of Q, there are a neighborhood W of Q, two perturbation domains B_s and B_u of order N_0 for $(f, \mathcal{U}_0)$, two finite families of tiles $\mathcal{C}_s$ and $\mathcal{C}_u$ associated to B_s and B_u respectively, two finite families of compact sets $\mathcal{D}_s$ and $\mathcal{D}_u$, and an integer n_0, such that:*

1. *V contains $\overline{W}$ and $\bigcup_{0\leq i\leq N_0-1} f^i(B_s \cup B_u)$.*
2. *$f^i(B_s) \cap f^j(B_u) = \emptyset$ for all $0 \leq i, j \leq N_0 - 1$,*
3. *each element of $\mathcal{D}_s$ is contained in the interior of an element of $\mathcal{C}_s$, and each element of $\mathcal{D}_u$ is contained in the interior of an element of $\mathcal{C}_u$. Moreover, each tile of $\mathcal{C}_s$ and $\mathcal{C}_u$ contains exactly an element of $\mathcal{D}_s \cup \mathcal{D}_u$*
4. *for any two pairs $D_s \in \mathcal{D}_s$ and $D_u \in \mathcal{D}_u$, there is $n \in \{0, \cdots, n_0\}$, such that $f^n(D_s) \cap D_u \neq \emptyset$.*
5. *for any point $z \in W \setminus W^s_{loc}(Q)$, there is $n > 0$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}_u$, such that $f^n(z) \in int(D)$ and $f^i(z) \in V$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. Moreover, if $f(z) \notin W$, then $n \leq n_0$.*
6. *for any point $z \in W \setminus W^u_{loc}(Q)$, there is $n > 0$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}_s$, such that $f^{-n}(z) \in int(D)$ and $f^{-i}(z) \in V$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. Moreover, if $f^{-1}(z) \notin W$, then $n \leq n_0$.*

7.3 Choice of a pseudo-orbit

By Lemma 7.3, we have the sequences of perturbation domains $(B_k)_{k\geq 0}$, tiles $(\mathcal{C}_k)_{k\geq 0}$ and families of compact sets $(\mathcal{D}_k)_{k\geq 0}$. Since there are only finitely many periodic orbits contained in $Per_{N_0}(f) \cap X$, we can take for each periodic orbit $Q \subset Per_{N_0}(f) \cap X$ an open neighborhood $V(Q) \subset U$ that are pairwise disjoint, disjoint from $\overline{U_1}$ and disjoint from $f^i(B_k)$ for any $0 \leq i \leq N_k - 1$ and any $k \geq 0$. By Lemma 7.4, we have for each Q the open set $W(Q)$, the perturbation domains $B_s(Q)$ and $B_u(Q)$, the families of tiles $\mathcal{C}_s(Q)$ and $\mathcal{C}_u(Q)$, the families of compact sets $\mathcal{D}_s(Q)$ and $\mathcal{D}_u(Q)$ and the number $n_0(Q)$. By the choice of $V(Q)$, we have that $f^i(B_\sigma(Q)) \cap f^j(B_k) = \emptyset$ for any $\sigma = s, u$, any $0 \leq i \leq N_k - 1$ and any $k \geq 0$.

We take the union of $(B_s(Q), \mathcal{C}_s(Q), \mathcal{D}_s(Q))$, $(B_u(Q), \mathcal{C}_u(Q), \mathcal{D}_u(Q))$ and $(B_0, \mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{D}_0)$, and to simplify the notations, we still denote the union by $(B_0, \mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{D}_0)$. By Remark 2.30, we know the modified $(B_0, \mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{D}_0)$ is still a perturbation domain of order N_0 for $(f, \mathcal{U}_0)$. Denote D'_k the union of the compact sets of the family $\mathcal{D}_k$ for each $k \geq 0$. Similar to the analysis of section 4.3 in [8], we assume that z is not in any of the perturbation domains that we have choose.

Recall that the support of the perturbation domain B_k is $supp(B_k) = \bigcup_{0\leq n\leq N_k-1} f^n(B_k)$. From the above constructions, the supports of the perturbation domains $(B_k)_{k\geq 0}$ are pairwise disjoint and are contained in U. Moreover, we have that $supp(B_k) \subset U_{k-1} \setminus \overline{U_{k+2}}$ for any $k \geq 0$.

Lemma 7.5. *There is an infinitely long pseudo-orbit $Y = (y_0, y_1, \cdots)$ for f contained in X that has jumps only in tiles of $(\mathcal{C}_k)_{k\geq 0}$ with $y_0 = z$ and $d(y_n, K) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Moreover, for each $k \geq 0$, there is a minimal number l_k, such that $y_i \in U_k$ for all $i \geq l_k$.*

Proof. By the former constructions, any point $x \in X_0$ has a positive iterate contained in the union of the interior of the compact set D'_0 and the open sets $W(Q)$ for all periodic orbits $Q \subset X \cap Per_{N_0}(f)$. Any point $x \in X_k$ has a positive iterate contained in the union of the interior of compact sets $D'_{k-1} \cup D'_k$ for $k \geq 1$. By the compactness of the sets X_k, there are integers T_k, compact sets $\tilde{D_k} \subset D'_k$, and compact sets $\tilde{W}(Q) \subset W(Q)$, such that

- all points $x \in X_0$ will enter the union of $\tilde{D_0}$ and $\tilde{W}(Q)$ for all $Q \subset X \cap Per_{N_0}(f)$ in time bounded by T_0,
- all points $x \in X_k$ will enter in $\tilde{D_{k-1}} \cup \tilde{D_k}$ for $k \geq 1$ in time bounded by T_k.

We can assume that T_0 is larger than $n_0(Q)$, for any $Q \subset X \cap Per_{N_0}(f)$.

Setting of the constants. For $k \geq 0$, set η_k to be smaller than half of the minimum of the distances between a point in $(\bigcup_{Q \subset X \cap Per_{N_0}(f)} \tilde{W}(Q)) \cup (\bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq k} \tilde{D_i})$ and a point in the completement of $(\bigcup_{Q \subset X \cap Per_{N_0}(f)} W(Q)) \cup (\bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq k} D'_i)$. Moreover, we also assume that η_k is smaller than half of the minimum of the distances between a point in $f(\overline{M \setminus U_k})$ to a point in U_{k+1}, and smaller than the minimum of the distances between a point in a compact set $D \in \mathcal{D}_k$ and a point on the boundary of the tile $C \in \mathcal{C}_k$ that contains D. Then for any $k \geq 0$, there is a number $0 < \varepsilon_k < \eta_k$, such that for any ε_k-pseudo-orbit $(x_0, \cdots, x_{T_k})$, we have $d(x_i, f^i(x_0)) < \frac{1}{2}\eta_k$, and $d(x_i, f^{i-T_k}(x_{T_k})) < \frac{1}{2}\eta_k$ for all $0 \leq i \leq T_k$. For each ε_k, there is a number $\delta_k \in (0, \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_k)$, such that, for any two points $x, y \in M$, if $d(x,y) < \delta_k$, then $d(f(x), f(y)) < \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_k$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that the sequences $(\eta_k)_{k \geq 0}$, $(\varepsilon_k)_{k \geq 0}$ and $(\delta_k)_{k \geq 0}$ are strictly decreasing sequences.

The sets $\tilde{X}_k$ and the pseudo-orbits Z_k. Now we take a finite δ_k-dense set $\tilde{X}_k$ of X_k for any $k \geq 0$, such that $z \in \tilde{X}_0$. For any $k \geq 0$, take a δ_k-pseudo-orbit $(y_1^k, \cdots, y_{m_k}^k)$ in $X \setminus K$, such that $y_1^k = z$ and $d(y_{m_k}^k, K) < \delta_k$. Then we project this pseudo-orbit to the set $\bigcup_{i \geq 0} \tilde{X}_i$: if $y_j^k \in X_i \setminus X_{i+1}$, then there is $z_j^k \in \tilde{X}_i$, such that $d(y_j^k, z_j^k) < \delta_i$. Then the pseudo-orbit $Z_k = (z_1^k, \cdots, z_{m_k}^k)$ is a pseudo-orbit contained in $\bigcup_{i \geq 0} \tilde{X}_i$ that connects z to K, where $z_1^k = z$. Moreover, if $y_j^k, y_{j+1}^k \in X_i$, we have $d(f(z_j^k), z_{j+1}^k) < d(f(z_j^k), f(y_j^k)) + d(f(y_j^k), y_{j+1}^k) + d(y_{j+1}^k, z_{j+1}^k) < \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_i + \delta_k + \delta_i < \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon_i + \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_k$. Hence $d(f(z_j^k), z_{j+1}^k) < \varepsilon_i$ when $k \geq i$. By cutting some part of Z_k, we can assume that $z_j^k \neq z_l^k$ for any $j \neq l$ and any $k \geq 0$. Then for any $k \geq 0$, there is a minimal integer $l(m,k)$, such that $z_i^k \in U_m$ for all $i > l(m,k)$.

The infinitely long pseudo-orbit Z. Since $\tilde{X}_k$ is a finite set for any $k \geq 0$, one can extract a subsequence (Z_k^1) of (Z_k), such that all pseudo-orbits in this subsequence have the same piece before staying in U_1, that is to say, $(z_1^k, \cdots, z_{l(1,k)}^k)$ are equal to each other for any $Z_k \in \{Z_k^1\}$. Similarly, there is a subsequence (Z_k^2) of (Z_k^1), such that all pseudo-orbits in this subsequence have the same piece before staying in U_2. We can continue this process, and finally, by taking the limit, we can get an infinitely long pseudo-orbit $Z = (z_1, z_2, \cdots)$ such that $z_1 = z$, $d(z_n, K) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Moreover, if $z_j, z_{j+1} \in X_i$, then $d(f(z_j), z_{j+1}) < \varepsilon_i$, since Z is a limit set of (Z_k).

By the analysis of Lemma 4.6 in [8], the pseudo-orbit $Z = (z_1, z_2, \cdots)$ has the property stated in the following claim. We omit the proof here since it follows exactly the proof of Lemma 4.6 in [8].

Claim 7.6. *There is a strictly increasing sequence* $t_0 = 1, t_1, \cdots$*, such that for* $j > 0$*,* z_{t_j} *is contained in a compact set* E_j *of* $\bigcup_{k\geq 0}\mathcal{D}_k$*. Moreover, for any* $j \geq 0$*,*

- *if* $E_j \in \mathcal{D}_0$*, then either* $t_j - t_{j-1} < T_1$ *or there is* $Q \subset X \cap Per_{N_0}(f)$*, such that* $E_{j-1} \in \mathcal{D}_s(Q)$ *and* $E_j \in \mathcal{D}_u(Q)$*,*
- *if* $E_j \in \mathcal{D}_k$ *for some* $k \geq 1$*, then* $t_j - t_{j-1} < T_k$*.*

Construction of the pseudo-orbit Y **from** Z**.** Now we replace some part of Z to get an infinitely long pseudo-orbit that connects $\tilde{U}$ to K, accumulates to K in the future, and has jumps only in the tiles of the perturbation domains. Using Claim 7.6, we construct Y as the following.

- If $E_j \in \mathcal{D}_0$ and $t_j - t_{j-1} < T_1$ or if $E_j \in \mathcal{D}_k$ where $k \geq 1$, we replace the piece of pseudo-orbit $(z_{t_{j-1}}, \cdots, z_{t_j})$ by the piece of true orbit $(z_{t_{j-1}}, f(z_{t_{j-1}}), \cdots, f^{t_j - t_{j-1}}(z_{t_{j-1}}))$.
- If $E_j \in \mathcal{D}_0$ and $t_j - t_{j-1} \geq T_1$, we have that there is $Q \subset X \cap Per_{N_0}(f)$, such that $E_{j-1} \in \mathcal{D}_s(Q)$ and $E_j \in \mathcal{D}_u(Q)$. By Lemma 7.4, there is a piece of true orbit $(x, f(x), \cdots, f^t(x))$ such that $x \in E_{j-1}$, $f^t(x) \in E_j$ and $t < T_0$. Then we replace the piece of pseudo-orbit $(z_{t_{j-1}}, \cdots, z_{t_j})$ by the piece of true orbit $(x, f(x), \cdots, f^t(x))$.

Then we get a new pseudo-orbit $Y = (y_0, y_1, \cdots)$. We can see that Y has jumps only in tiles of $(\mathcal{C}_k)_{k\geq 0}$ with $y_0 = z$ and $d(y_n, K) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Moreover, there is a minimal number l_k, such that $y_i \in U_k$ for all $i \geq l_k$ and all $k \geq 0$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 7.5. □

7.4 The connecting processes

We take the infinitely long pseudo-orbit $Y = (y_0, y_1, \cdots)$ with $y_0 = z$ contained in X from Lemma 7.5. Then Y has jumps only in tiles of $(\mathcal{C}_k)_{k\geq 0}$ and $d(y_n, K) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Moreover, for each $k \geq 0$, there is a minimal number l_k, such that $y_i \in U_k$ for all $i \geq l_k$. For the pseudo-orbit $Y = (y_0, y_1, \cdots)$ and the sequence of integers $(l_k)_{k\geq 0}$, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 7.7. *For each* $k \geq 0$*, there are a diffeomorphism* f_k*, an infinitely long pseudo-orbit* $Y_k = (y_0^k, y_1^k, \cdots)$ *of* f_k *with* $y_0^k = z$*, and two sequences of positive integers* $(m_k)_{k\geq 0}$ *and* $(n_k)_{k\geq 0}$*, and if we denote* $f = f_{-1}$*, then for any* $k \geq 0$*, the following properties are satisfied.*

1. *There is* $\phi_k \in \mathcal{V}_k$*, such that* $\phi_k = Id|_{M\setminus supp(B_k)}$*, and* $f_k = f_{k-1} \circ \phi_k$*.*
2. *The integer* m_{k-1} *is the smallest positive integer, such that* $f_k^{m_{k-1}}(z) \in U_{k-1}$*. Moreover, we have* $m_{k-1} < m_k$*.*
3. *The piece of pseudo-orbit* $(y_0^k, y_1^k, \cdots, y_{m_{k-1}-1}^k)$ *for* f_k *equals* $(z, f_k(z), \cdots, f_k^{m_{k-1}-1}(z))$*.*
4. $n_k \leq l_{k+2}$*, and* $y_{n_k+m}^k = y_{l_{k+2}+m}$*, for all* $m \geq 0$*.*
5. *The pseudo-orbit* Y_k *of* f_k *has only jumps in the tiles* $\{\mathcal{C}_{k+1}, \mathcal{C}_{k+2}, \cdots\}$*.*

Proof. We build the sequences by induction. We construct f_{k+1}, Y_{k+1}, n_{k+1} and m_k after f_k, Y_k, n_k and m_{k-1} has been built.

The constructions for $n = 0$**.** Consider $(f, \mathcal{U}_0, B_0)$. By Definitions 2.27 and 2.28, and the fact that the pseudo-orbit Y of f has jumps only in tiles of $(\mathcal{C}_k)_{k\geq 0}$, there are a diffeomorphism $f_0 \in \mathcal{U}_0$, and an infinitely long pseudo-orbit $Y_0 = (y_0^0, y_1^0, \cdots)$ of f_0 with $y_0^0 = z$, which connects some pieces of Y, satisfying the following three properties.

- The diffeomorphism f_0 coincides with f outside $supp(B_0)$, hence there is $\phi_0 \in \mathcal{V}_0$, such that $\phi_0 = Id|_{M\setminus supp(B_0)}$, and $f_0 = f \circ \phi_0$, which is the property *1.*

– The pseudo-orbit Y_0 has only jumps in the tiles $\{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \cdots\}$, which is the property *5*. Since $supp(B_0) \cap \overline{U_2} = \emptyset$, and for all $i \geq l_2$, the point $y_i \in U_2$, then there is a positive integer n_0, such that $y_{n_0+m} = y_{l_2+m}$, for all $m \geq 0$. Moreover, from Definition 2.27, we can see that $n_0 \leq l_2$. Hence the property *4* is satisfied. We do not have to check the properties *2* and *3* for $n = 0$.

The constructions for $n = k+1$. For $k \geq 0$, assume that f_n, Y_k, m_{k-1} and n_k have been built for all $n \leq k$. The infinitely long pseudo-orbit $Y_k = (y_0^k, y_1^k, \cdots)$ of f_k with $y_0^k = z$, has only jumps in the tiles $\{\mathcal{C}_{k+1}, \mathcal{C}_{k+2}, \cdots\}$. Moreover, the piece of the pseudo-orbit $(y_0^k, y_1^k, \cdots, y_{m_{k-1}-1}^k)$ coincides with $(z, f_k(z), \cdots, f_k^{m_{k-1}-1}(z))$ and the piece of the pseudo-orbit $(y_{n_k}^k, y_{n_k+1}^k, \cdots)$ coincides with $(y_{l_{k+2}}, y_{l_{k+2}+1}, \cdots)$. Then by Definitions 2.27 and 2.28 and by the fact that $supp(B_{k+1}) \cap \overline{U_{k+3}} = \emptyset$, there is a diffeomorphism f_{k+1}, satisfying the following properties.

- The diffeomorphism f_{k+1} is of the form $f_{k+1} = f_k \circ \phi_{k+1}$, where $\phi_{k+1} \in \mathcal{V}_{k+1}$ coincides with Id outside $supp(B_{k+1})$, which is the property *1*.
- There is a pseudo-orbit $Y_{k+1} = (y_0^{k+1}, y_1^{k+1}, \cdots)$ of f_{k+1} with $y_0^{k+1} = z$, which connects some pieces of Y_k and has jumps only in the tiles $\{\mathcal{C}_{k+2}, \mathcal{C}_{k+3}, \cdots\}$, which is the property *5*.
- There is a positive integer $n_{k+1} \leq l_{k+3}$, such that the piece of the pseudo-orbit $(y_{n_{k+1}}^{k+1}, y_{n_{k+1}+1}^{k+1}, \cdots)$ coincides with $(y_{l_{k+3}}, y_{l_{k+3}+1}, \cdots)$, which is the property *4*.

Then we take the smallest integer m_k, such that $f_{k+1}^{m_{k+1}}(z) \in U_{k+1}$. Particularly, we take m_k as the following:

- we take $m_0 = 1$,
- when $k \geq 1$, we take m_k such that $f_{k+1}^{m_{k+1}}(z) \in U_{k+1}$, and for all $0 \leq i < m+k+1$, we have $f_{k+1}^i(z) \notin U_k$.

Since $supp(B_{k+1}) \subset U_k \setminus \overline{U_{k+3}}$, the diffeomorphism f_{k+1} coincides with f_k on the piece of orbit $(z, f_k(z), \cdots, f_k^{m_{k-1}-1}(z))$. By the item *2* of Lemma 7.1, we have that $m_{k-1} < m_k$, which is the property *2*. The property *3* is satisfied since the new pseudo-orbit Y_{k+1} has no jumps in $\mathcal{C}_{k+2}$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 7.7. ☐

End of the proof of Proposition 3. Now we consider the sequences $(f_k)_{k\geq 0}$, $(Y_k)_{k\geq 0}$, $(m_k)_{k\geq 0}$ and $(n_k)_{k\geq 0}$ from Lemma 7.7. By the choice of $(\mathcal{U}_k)_k$ (see $Property(F)$), the sequence of diffeomorphism $f_k = f \circ \phi_0 \circ \cdots \circ \phi_k$ converges to a diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$. And since the diameters of the pairwise disjoint perturbations domains can be chosen arbitrarily small by Lemma 2.32, we can take g to be arbitrarily C^0-close to f. Moreover, since the supports of all perturbation domains of $(B_k)_{k\leq 0}$ are contained in U, we have that $g = f|_{M\setminus U}$.

Since $supp(B_{k+1}) \subset U_k \setminus \overline{U_{k+3}}$, by the items *2* and *3* of Lemma 7.7, the piece of orbit $(z, f_k(z), \cdots, f_k^{m_{k-1}-1}(z))$ is also a piece of orbit of f_n, when $n \geq k+1$. This implies that the limit of the sequence of pseudo-orbits Y_k is the positive orbit of z under g since the sequence $(m_k)_{k\geq 0}$ is strictly increasing. By the item *4* of Lemma 7.7, we can see that $orb^+(z, g)$ has only finitely many points outside U_k for any $k \geq 0$ (bounded by n_k), hence $\omega(z, g) \subset K$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 3. ☐

8 Proofs of the applications

In this section, we give the proofs of the applications of the main theorem.

8.1 Structural stability and hyperbolicity

To prove Corollary 1.3, we use some of the results in [43, 47, 49, 50]. We take two steps: first, we prove that the statement is true for a residual subset of $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, and then we prove it for all diffeomorphisms in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$.

Assume that $H(p)$ is the homoclinic class of a hyperbolic periodic point p of a diffeomorphism $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. We state two properties as follows:

- $(P1)$ There are $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $C > 0$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$, such that $H(p)$ admits an (m, λ)-dominated splitting $T_{H(p)}M = E \oplus F$ with $dim(E) = ind(p)$. And for any periodic point q homoclinically related to p, denote by $\tau(q)$ the period of q, then the followings are satisfied:
$$\prod_{0\le i<\tau(q)/m} \|Df^m|_{E(f^{im}(q))}\| < C\lambda^{\tau(q)},$$
$$\prod_{0\le i<\tau(q)/m} \|Df^{-m}|_{F(f^{-im}(q))}\| < C\lambda^{\tau(q)}.$$
- $(P2)$ $H(p)$ is shadowable and every periodic pseudo-orbit can be shadowed by a periodic orbit.

Now we state the following two Lemmas, whose proofs will be omitted.

Lemma 8.1. (Theorem 1.1 of [50]) *Assume that f is a diffeomorphism in* $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$*. If a homoclinic class $H(p)$ is structurally stable, then the property $(P1)$ is satisfied for $H(p)$.*

Lemma 8.2. (Proposition 4.1 of [50]) *Assume that f is a diffeomorphism in* $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ *and p is a hyperbolic periodic point. If the two properties $(P1)$ and $(P2)$ are satisfied, then $H(p)$ is hyperbolic.*

Lemma 8.3. (Proposition 2.4 of [49] and Proposition 3.3 of [49]) *The conclusions of Lemma 8.1 and Lemma 8.2 are also valid for the chain recurrence class $C(p)$.*

Proof of Corollary 1.3. By Theorem B, for any diffeomorphism f contained in a residual subset $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, if the property $(P1)$ is satisfied for a homoclinic class $H(p)$ of f, then $H(p)$ is hyperbolic. We can take $\mathcal{B}$ such that $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{R}$, where $\mathcal{R}$ is the residual subset in Lemma 2.34. Hence by Lemma 8.1, for any diffeomorphism $f \in \mathcal{B}$, if a homoclinic class $H(p)$ is structurally stable, then it is hyperbolic.

Now we assume that f is an arbitrarily diffeomorphism in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. If a homoclinic class $H(p)$ of f is structurally stable, then there is a C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f, such that, for any $h \in \mathcal{U}$, there is a homeomorphism $\phi : H(p) \to H(p_h)$, satisfying $\phi \circ f|_{H(p)} = h \circ \phi|_{H(p)}$. Since $\mathcal{B}$ is residual in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$, we can take a diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{U}$. Therefore, $H(p_g)$ is structurally stable, where $\mathcal{U}$ is the neighborhood of g in the definition of structurally stable. Then $H(p_g)$ is hyperbolic by the argument above, hence $H(p_g)$ satisfies the property $(P2)$. It is easy to see that the property $(P2)$ is unchanged under conjugacy, thus is satisfied by $H(p)$ since $f \in \mathcal{U}$. The property $(P1)$ is satisfied by $H(p)$ by Lemma 8.1. Then by Lemma 8.2, we have that $H(p)$ is hyperbolic. This finishes the proof for homoclinic classes.

For chain recurrence classes of a hyperbolic periodic point, we only have to show that Corollary 1.3 is valid for $f \in \mathcal{B}$, and then with the same argument as above, we can get the conclusion. Assume $f \in \mathcal{B}$ and p is a hyperbolic periodic point of f. By item 2 of Lemma 2.34, $C(p) = H(p)$. By Lemma 8.3, the property $(P1)$ is satisfied for $C(p)$ and hence for $H(p)$. Thus $C(p) = H(p)$ is hyperbolic. This finishes the proof of Corollary 1.3. □

8.2 Partial hyperbolicity

Now we give the proofs of Corollary 1.4 and Corollary 1.5.

Proof of Corollary 1.4. We just prove when $dim(E)$ is smaller than the smallest index of periodic orbits contained in $H(p)$, thus $dim(E) < ind(p)$. Assume E is not contracted, by the conclusion of the main theorem, we can get a sequence of periodic orbits $orb(q_n) \subset H(p)$ with arbitrarily long periods such that $ind(q_n) = dim(E)$, which contradicts to the assumption that $dim(E) < ind(q_n)$. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.5. We assume that f satisfies the properties in Lemma 2.34 and that of the main theorem. For a homoclinic class $H(p)$ of f, we denote by $j \geq 1$ and $l \leq d-1$ the smallest and the largest index of periodic point contained in $H(p)$. From [1], one has that for any $j \leq i \leq l$, the hyperbolic periodic points with index i are dense in $H(p)$. By Theorem A of [44], $H(p)$ admits a dominated splitting with index i. By Remark 2.7, we have that $H(p)$ admits a dominated splitting $T_{H(p)}M = E^{cs} \oplus E_1^c \oplus \cdots \oplus E_n^c \oplus E^{cu}$, where $dim(E^{cs}) = j$, $n = l - j$, and $dim(E_i^c) = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Since $H(p)$ contains hyperbolic periodic points with index i for all $j \leq i \leq l$, we can see easily that the central bundle E_i^c is neither contracted nor expanded, for any $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Now we consider the bundles E^{cs} and E^{cu}. If the bundle E^{cs} is contracted and E^{cu} is expanded, then we get the partially hyperbolic splitting and the smallest or largest index of periodic orbits contained in $H(p)$ also satisfy the conclusion. Let us assume otherwise that E^{cs} is not contracted. By our main theorem, there are periodic orbits with arbitrarily long period and index j, whose largest Lyapunov exponent along E^{cs} converges to 0. Moreover, such periodic orbits form a dense set in $H(p)$. Since f is far away from tangency, the other Lyapunov exponents of such periodic orbits along E^{cs} are uniformly controlled by the largest one. Thus by the Franks' Lemma, there are periodic orbits with index $j-1$ in any neighborhood of $H(p)$ by C^1 small perturbations. Then by a genericity argument like in Section 4.7, for the diffeomorphism f, $H(p)$ can be accumulated by periodic orbits with index $j-1$. Therefore, by Theorem A of [44] and Remark 2.7, E^{cs} has a dominated splitting $E^{cs} = E^s \oplus E_0^c$ with $dim(E_0^c) = 1$. By Corollary 1.4, we have that E^s is contracted. With similar argument to E^{cu}, we get that $H(p)$ admits a partially hyperbolic splitting $T_{H(p)}M = E^s \oplus E_1^c \oplus \cdots \oplus E_k^c \oplus E^u$ with each central bundle of dimension 1 and neither contracted nor expanded. Moreover, the minimal index of periodic points contained in $H(p)$ is $dim(E^s)$ or $dim(E^s)+1$, and the maximal one is $d - dim(E^u)$ or $d - dim(E^u) - 1$. By the main theorem, there exist periodic orbits contained in $H(p)$ with arbitrarily long periods with a Lyapunov exponent along E_i^c arbitrarily close to 0. This finishes the proof. $\square$

8.3 Lyapunov stable homoclinic classes

Now we give the proofs of Corollary 1.6 and Corollary 1.7.

Proof of Corollary 1.6. From Corollary 1.4, we only have to prove the case when $dim(E)$ equals to the largest index of periodic orbits contained in $H(p)$. The idea of the proof follows from [39] and Section 3 of [4]. We just give an explanation here and for more details, please refer to [39] and Section 3 of [4].

Assume $f \in \mathcal{R}$ where $\mathcal{R}$ is the residual set in Lemma 2.34. There is a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f, such that the items 3, 4 and 6 stated in Lemma 2.34 are satisfied for $(f, H(p), \mathcal{U})$. We can assume that p has the largest index among the periodic points contained in $H(p)$, hence

$dim(E) = ind(p)$. Assume that the bundle F is not expanded, then by the conclusion of the Theorem A, we can get a sequence of periodic orbits $orb(q_n)$ homoclinically related to $orb(p)$ with arbitrarily long period such that the smallest Lyapunov exponent of $orb(q_n)$ along the bundle F can be arbitrarily close to 0. By Lemma 2.3 of [26], we can assume that all the eigenvalues of $\|Df\|$ along $orb(q_n)$ are real. Then by Theorem 1 of [28] (Theorem 2.5 in [4]) and a proper construction of a path of diffeomorphism (see [4]), there is a diffeomorphism $g \in \mathcal{U}$ and a periodic point q of g with index larger than $dim(E)$ such that $W^s(q) \cap W^u(p_g) \neq \emptyset$. By C^1 small perturbation, we can assume that $W^s(q)$ intersects $W^u(p_g)$ transversely. This property is persistent under C^1 perturbation, since $ind(q)+ind(p_g) > dim(M)$. Hence there is a neighborhood $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U}$ of g, such that for any $h \in \mathcal{V}$, we have $W^s(q_h) \pitchfork W^u(p_h) \neq \emptyset$. Take a diffeomorphism $h \in \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{R}$, then $H(p_h)$ is Lyapunov stable by the item 6 of Lemma 2.34, and hence $q_h \in H(p_h)$. This contradicts the item 4 of Lemma 2.34 by the choice of $\mathcal{U}$, since $ind(q_h) > ind(p_h) = ind(p)$. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.7. We assume that the second item does not happen. By Lemma 2.34, all periodic orbits contained in $H(p)$ have the same index. By [39], $H(p)$ has a dominated splitting $T_{H(p)}M = E \oplus F$ such that $dim(E) = ind(p)$. By Corollary 1.6, we have that the bundle F is expanded. With the same argument to f^{-1} and the bundle E, we get that E is contracted for f. Hence the splitting $T_{H(p)}M = E \oplus F$ is hyperbolic. Then $H(p)$ is a hyperbolic chain recurrence class by item 2 of Lemma 2.34. Hence by a standard argument using the shadowing lemma, $H(p)$ is an isolated chain recurrence class. By Theorem 5 of [2], since M is connected, the homoclinic class $H(p)$ is in fact the whole manifold, hence f is Anosov. $\square$

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to Prof. Lan Wen and Prof. Sylvain Crovisier, who have given me great help and encouragement. Professor Sylvain Crovisier gave me many useful suggestions both in solving the problem and in the writing of the paper, and Professor Lan Wen carefully listened to the proof and gave me many useful comments. I would also like to thank Shaobo Gan, Dawei Yang, Rafael Potrie, Xiao Wen and Nicolas Gourmelon for listening to the proof and for useful discussions. Dawei Yang pointed out to me that one can prove that structurally stable homoclinic classes are hyperbolic with the conclusion of the main theorem. This work was done when I was in University Paris-Sud 11 as a joint PhD student under the supervision of Lan Wen and Sylvain Crovisier, and I would like to thank University Paris-Sud 11 for the hospitality and China Scholarship Council (CSC) for financial support (201306010008).

References

[1] F. Abdenur, C. Bonatti, S. Crovisier, L. Díaz and L. Wen, Periodic points and homoclinic classes. *Ergodic Theory & Dynam. Systems* **27** (2007), 1–22.

[2] F. Abdenur, C. Bonatti and L. Díaz, Nonwandering sets with non empy interior. *Nonlinearity* **17** (2004), 175–191.

[3] N. Aoki, The set of Axiom A diffeomorphisms with no cycles. *Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat.* **23** (1992), 21–65.

[4] A. Arbieto, B. Carvalho,W. Cordeiro and D.J. Obata, On bi-Lyapunov stable homoclinic classes. *Bull. Braz. Math. Soc.* **44** (2013), 105–127.

[5] M.-C. Arnaud, Le "closing lemma" en topologie C^1. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr.* **74** (1998).

[6] M.-C. Arnaud, Création de connexions en topologie C^1. *Ergodic Theory* & *Dynam. Systems* **21** (2001), 339–381.

[7] C. Bonatti, Towards a global view of dynamical systems, for the C^1-topology. *Ergodic Theory* & *Dynam. Systems* **31** (2011), 959–993.

[8] C. Bonatti and S. Crovisier, Récurrence et généricité. *Invent. Math.* **158** (2004), 33–104.

[9] C. Bonatti, S. Crovisier, L. Díaz and N. Gourmelon, Internal perturbations of homoclinic classes: non-domination, cycles, and self-replication. *Ergodic Theory* & *Dynam. Systems* **33** (2013), 739–776.

[10] C. Bonatti and L. Díaz, On maximal transitive sets of generic diffeomorphisms. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* **96** (2003), 171–197.

[11] C. Bonatti and L. Díaz, Robust heterodimensional cycles and C^1-generic dynamics. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* **7** (2008), 469–525.

[12] C. Bonatti, L. Díaz and M. Viana, *Dynamics beyond uniform hyperbolicity. A global geometric and probabilistic perspective,* Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences **102**. Mathematical Physics, III. Springer-Verlag (2005).

[13] C. Bonatti, S. Gan and D. Yang, On the hyperbolicity of homoclinic classes. *Disc. Cont. Dynam. Syst.* **25** (2009), 1143–1162.

[14] Y. Cao, S. Luzzatto and I. Rios, A non-hyperbolic system with strictly non-zero Lyapunov exponents for all invariant measures. *Disc. Cont. Dyn. Syst.* **15**(1) (2006), 61–71.

[15] C. Conley, Isolated Invariant Sets and the Morse Index. *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics* **38**, American Mathematical Society, Providence. RI (1978).

[16] S. Crovisier, Saddle-node bifurcations for hyperbolic sets. *Ergodic Theory* & *Dynam. Systems* **22** (2002), 1079–1115.

[17] S. Crovisier, Periodic orbits and chain-transitive sets of C^1-diffeomorphisms. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* **104** (2006), 87–141.

[18] S. Crovisier, Partial hyperbolicity far from homoclinic bifurcations. *Advances in Math.* **226** (2011), 673–726.

[19] S. Crovisier, Perturbation de la dynamique de difféomorphismes en petite régularité. *Astérisque* **354** (2013).

[20] S. Crovisier, Dynamics of C^1-diffeomorphisms: global description and prospect of classification. arXiv:1405.0305.

[21] S. Crovisier and E. Pujals, Essential hyperbolicity and homoclinic bifurcations: a dichotomy phenomenon/mechanism for diffeomorphisms. To appear at *Invent. Math.* arXiv:1011.3836.

[22] S. Crovisier, M. Sambarino and D. Yang, Partial hyperbolicity and homoclinic tangencies. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **17** (2015), 1–49.

[23] L. Díaz, V. Horita, I. Rios and M. Sambarino, Destroying horseshoes via heterodimensional cycles: generating bifurcations inside homoclinic classes. *Ergodic Theory & Dynam. Systems* **29** (2009), 433–474.

[24] J. Franks, Necessary conditions for stability of diffeomorphisms. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **158** (1971), 301–308.

[25] S. Gan and L.Wen, Heteroclinic cycles and homoclinic closures for generic diffeomorphisms. *J. Dynam. Diff. Eq.* **15** (2003), 451–471.

[26] S. Gan and D. Yang, Expansive homoclinic classes. *Nonlinearity* **22** (2009), 729–734.

[27] N. Gourmelon, Adapted metrics for dominated splittings. *Ergodic Theory & Dynam. Systems* **27** (2007), 1839–1849.

[28] N. Gourmelon, A Frank's lemma that preserves invariant manifolds. To appear at *Ergodic Theory & Dynam. Systems.* arXiv:0912.1121v2.

[29] S. Hayashi, Connecting invariant manifolds and the solution of the C^1-stability and Ω-stability conjectures for flows. *Ann. of Math.* **145** (1997), 81–137.

[30] S. Hayashi, Diffeomorphisms in $\mathcal{F}^1(M)$ satisfy Axiom A. *Ergodic Theory & Dynam. Systems* **12** (1992), 233–253.

[31] M. Hirsch, C. Pugh and M. Shub, *Invariant Manifolds. Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **583**, Springer Verlag, Berlin (1977).

[32] S. Liao, On the stability conjecture. *Chinese Ann. Math.* **1** (1980), 9–30.

[33] S. Liao, Obstruction sets II, *Acta Sci. Natur. Univ. Pekinensis,* **2** (1981), 1–36. (in Chinese)

[34] R. Mañé, An ergodic closing lemma. *Ann. of Math.* **116** (1982), 503–540.

[35] R. Mañé, A proof of the C^1 stability conjecture. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, **66** (1988), 161–210.

[36] J. Palis, On the C^1 Ω-stability conjecture. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, **66** (1988), 211–215.

[37] J. Palis, A global view of dynamics and a conjecture on the denseness of finitude of attractors. *Astérisque* **261** (2000), 335–347.

[38] V. Pliss, On a conjecture due to Smale. *Differ. Uravn.* **8** (1972), 262–268.

[39] R. Potrie, Generic bi-Lyapunov stable homoclinic classes. *Nonlinearity* **23**, (2010), 1631–1649.

[40] E. Pujals and M. Sambarino, Homoclinic tangencies and hyperbolicity for suface diffeomorphisms. *Ann. of Math.* **151** (2000), 961–1023.

[41] E. Pujals and M. Sambarino, On the dynamics of dominated splitting. *Ann. of Math.* **169** (2009), 675–740.

[42] I. Rios, Unfolding homoclinic tangencies inside horseshoes: hyperbolicity, fractal dimensions and persistent tangencies, *Nonlinearity* **14** (2001), 431–462.

[43] M. Sambarino and J. Vieitez, On C^1-persistently expansive homoclinic classes. *Disc. Cont. Dyn. Syst.* **14** (2006), 465–481.

[44] L. Wen, Homoclinic tangencies and dominated splittings. *Nonlinearity* **15** (2002), 1445–1469.

[45] L. Wen, A uniform C^1 connecting lemma. *Disc. Cont. Dyn. Syst.* **8** (2002), 257–265.

[46] L. Wen, The selecting lemma of Liao. *Disc. Cont. Dyn. Syst.* **20** (2008), 159–175.

[47] L. Wen and X. Wen, Codimension one structurally stable chain classes. To appear at *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*

[48] L. Wen and Z. Xia, C^1 connecting lemmas. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **352** (2000), 5213–5230.

[49] X. Wen, S. Gan and L. Wen, C^1-stably shadowable chain classes are hyperbolic. *J. Dynam. Diff. Eq.*, **246** (2009), 340–357.

[50] X. Wen, Structurally Stable Homoclinic Classes. arXiv:1410.4552.

Xiaodong Wang
School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, Beijing, 100871, P.R. China
Laboratoire de Mathématiques d'Orsay, Université Paris-Sud 11, Orsay 91405, France
E-mail: `xdwang1987@gmail.com`